

CHAPTER SEVEN

Renunciation in the Later Middle Period

Movements of deviant renunciation took shape under particular social and cultural circumstances. The Qalandariyah and the Haydariyah first flourished in the Arab Middle East and Iran in the seventh-eighth/thirteenth-fourteenth centuries, simultaneously spreading to Muslim India in the east and Anatolia in the west. The Abdals of Rüm, by contrast, attained their apogee in the second half of the ninth/fifteenth and the first half of the tenth/sixteenth centuries. They were, moreover, on the whole restricted to Ottoman lands in Anatolia and the Balkans. Significantly, the rise to prominence of this particularly Ottoman group was accompanied by a revivification of the older movements of the Qalandariyah and the Haydariyah in the same period and same geographical area.

The Qalandars, Haydaris, and Abdals of Rüm were, however, only the most prominent in spread and duration, so far as this is reflected in historical sources, of the ascetic dervish groups of the Later Middle Period. There were many others. The followers of Barak Baba emerged as a separate dervish band in Asia Minor and western Iran shortly after the formation of the Qalandariyah and the Haydariyah during the seventh/thirteenth century. Later, while the Abdals of Rüm were active in Ottoman lands, other dervish groups—the Jāmis, Shams-i Tabrizis, and early Bektāşis and the Jalālis and Madāris—made their presence felt in Asia Minor and in India, respectively.

What the Arab Middle East and Muslim India in the seventh-eighth/thirteenth-fourteenth century had in common with Ottoman Anatolia in the late ninth/fifteenth century was the presence of

societal conditions that allowed the firm and decisive incorporation of institutional Sufism into the social fabric of everyday life. In the Fertile Crescent, the spread of institutional Sufism, already set in motion by the Selçukids, was clearly associated with the devoted patronage of the ruling Ayyūbid elite, who were responsible for the construction of numerous hospices as well as the establishment of pious endowments of all sizes for the Sufis. The policies of the Ayyūbids, continued by their successors the Bahrī Mamlūks, were paralleled by those of the ruling classes of the Sultanate of Delhi in India, where the Chishtī, Suhrawardī, and Qādirī orders rapidly became ineradicably implanted in Indian Muslim culture. However, in Asia Minor, and to a certain extent in Iran, the spread of the Sufi orders (*ṭarīqahs*) was delayed considerably owing to a social upheaval of the first order—the Mongol invasions, which were followed by unprecedented social and cultural instability as well as political fragmentation. When, after the first quarter of the ninth/fifteenth century, a remarkable degree of political and cultural unity was achieved under the Timūrids in Khorasan and Transoxania as well as the Ottomans in Anatolia and the Balkans, the *ṭarīqahs* rapidly asserted themselves in the form of the Naqshbandīyah in the case of the Timūrids and initially the looser Bayrāmīye and later the Ḥalvetīye and Zeynīye in that of the Ottomans, to mention only the most important.

The antinomian rejection of society represented by deviant dervish groups developed concomitantly with, and primarily in reaction to, the organized Sufism of the socially respectable *ṭarīqahs*. The former trod in the footsteps of the latter and inevitably surfaced in places where institutional Sufism had taken root. Before reviewing the complicated relationship between organized Sufism and socially deviant renunciation, however, a typological account of the institutionalization of Sufism will be useful.

INSTITUTIONAL SUFISM

Sufism, as noted earlier, developed primarily in Iraq as a brilliant synthesis of world-affirming and world-denying tendencies within Islam during the third-fourth/ninth-tenth centuries. It quickly and successfully domesticated the powerful renunciative movement active in that region by absorbing asceticism and transforming it into a step

in a larger process of spiritual purification. Partly on account of this success and partly owing to the attractive power of its socially tame individualism, Sufi piety began to appeal to ever greater numbers of the "people of the community," in particular the religious scholars. At first tenuous, this nascent alliance between Sufism and the thoroughly populist piety of the religious scholars (*'ulamā'*) demonstrated its social efficacy when it completely absorbed or neutralized Malāmatī and Karrāmī trends in Khorasan, culturally the second most developed region of Islamdom after Iraq during the fourth-fifth/tenth-eleventh centuries.

During late High Caliphal times and the first century of the Early Middle Period (fourth-fifth/tenth-eleventh centuries), Sufism was thus poised to become a major building block of the new international Islamic social order that was taking shape after the collapse of the 'Abbāsid Empire.¹ The inner-worldly mystical outlook of Sufism, with its distinctive conceptual framework now largely in place, was about to step into the social arena to transform society along channels that conformed to this new worldview. The social mission of Sufism, which was, in broad terms, to infuse all levels of social life with Sufi ideas and practices, was accomplished through the progressive unfolding of two closely related processes, the rise of the *ṭarīqah* and the development of popular cults around the friends of God, the *awliyā'*.

During the course of the Early Middle Period, Sufi ideas and practices were subjected to a far-reaching process of organization and regularization that led, at the end of the period, to the emergence and spread of a new social institution, the *ṭarīqah*. The evolution of this socially most significant phase of Sufism, hitherto studied only in its barest outlines, followed different timetables in different regions of Islamdom, which consisted of many distinct political and cultural components.² The contours of the *ṭarīqah* were the same everywhere, however, and can be described along diachronic and synchronic axes.

The central feature of the *ṭarīqah* on the diachronic level was the establishment of a *silsilah*, the temporal propagation of a master's teaching in the form of a continuous chain of authorities. The *silsilah* is best visualized as a spiritual chain of intermediaries. It served simultaneously to perpetuate the example of a particular Sufi master and to create a single spiritual family of adherents around his "path." When they were later extended backward in time from the founding

masters to the Prophet Muḥammad through members of his family or the first caliph, Abū Bakr (d. 13/634), *silsilahs* also provided religious legitimacy to the Sufi paths by linking them directly to the *sunnah*.³

The elevation of the religious example of a historical figure to the seat of transgenerational authority was by no means peculiar to Sufism. The rise of a class of intermediaries between God and the community in the form of a set of pious forefathers was a feature shared by all areas of religious learning in the Early Middle Period. This mediationist mode of religiosity, always kept alive by the Shīʿī tradition, was behind not only the development and consolidation of the four Sunnī legal schools but also the concomitant phenomenon of imitation (*taqlīd*) of pious forefathers, which crystallized at the end of this period in the form of clearly articulated intellectual positions. It was a sign of the increasingly communal nature of the mission of Sufism that it too participated vigorously in the creation of the mediating *religiosi*. The Sufi masters now stepped out of their restricted social enclaves to embrace the Muslim community at large, and their spiritual and physical presence became evident in the form of great numbers of tomb-complexes that punctuated the landscape of Islamdom with ever increasing frequency.

The creation of mediating hierarchies on the diachronic level was accompanied by the construction of mediating structures on the synchronic level, reflected in the gradual replacement of the looser teacher-pupil relationship of "classical" Sufism by one of director and disciple. The process involved four elements.

1. Physical concentration of directors and disciples within the confines of a single residential quarter, the Sufi lodge or hospice (*khānqāh*, *zāwiyah*, *tekke*, *dargāh*).

2. Careful delineation of a group identity through the development of distinct rites and practices for the core members of the *ṭarīqah*. The most significant of these included (a) the initiation ceremony, which marked entry into the group through specific rites such as investiture with the woolen habit and cutting of the hair; (b) the stipulation of distinct spiritual disciplines and techniques such as the mystical prayer (*dhikr*), mystical audition sometimes accompanied by ritual dance (*samāʿ*), and regulated seclusion (*khalwah*); (c) the specification of special apparel and paraphernalia; and (d) the adoption

Describe it
in detail

11

of a series of injunctions that regulated all other aspects of disciples' lives such as moral etiquette and economic behavior.

3. Articulation of a distinct spiritual path to be traversed by all disciples and to be enforced on them by the master.

4. Propagation of the master's teaching from the center toward the community in the form of rippling group identities. When fully realized, this hierarchy of groups included the grades of director (*shaykh*, *pīr*, *murshid*), subordinate leader (*khalīfah*, *muqaddam*), disciple (*murīd*), associate or lay affiliate, and sympathizer. The core of the *ṭarīqah* was thus surrounded by social factions on several levels.⁴

The formation of institutional Sufism was not completed with the full-fledged development of the *ṭarīqah*. Sufism grew deeper institutional roots in society with the evolution of popular cults around the *awliyāʾ* or friends of God. Although the cult of the *awliyāʾ*, defined as "an ideological and ritual complex," should analytically be distinguished from the *ṭarīqah* as "a form of religious association," the ideational and practical overlap between the two phenomena is remarkable.⁵ From the perspective of the present study, the significant point is that the cult of the *awliyāʾ* proved to be fertile ground for the propagation, admittedly in transmuted fashion, of Sufi ideas and practices. The entire ideological component of the *awliyāʾ* cult—sainthood (*walāyah*) and many of its ritual aspects such as the communal *dhikr* and/or *samāʿ*—was adapted from Sufism. Other constituent elements, most notably the *ziyārah* (visitation of tombs and related holy sites), have their origins outside Sufism proper.

The complicated history of the *awliyāʾ* cult remains to be written.⁶ It is clear, however, that its widespread dissemination occurred concomitantly with the formation of the Sufi orders during the sixth-seventh/twelfth-thirteenth centuries. Whatever the exact nature of the relationship between these two processes, there is no doubt that they were closely intertwined. Sufism supplied the theoretical underpinning of the *awliyāʾ* cult, while the cult ensured the entrenchment of the orders in all social strata. The *ṭarīqah* and the saint cult came to function as two sides of the same coin.

Although the evolution of the Sufi orders and of the popular saint cults around them took place along different routes in different regions of Islamdom, the major characteristics of this process remained the same everywhere. The legal institution of the charitable

To change or
make sth
change

endowment (*waqf*) was the most prominent instrument in the creation of Sufi social agencies. The wealthy upper classes, especially the political elites, endowed numerous facilities for the use of Sufis. In Syria, Iraq, and Egypt, the Ayyūbids and the Bahārī Mamlūks were committed to the idea of the "royal hospice" (*khānqāh*), grandiose establishments totally controlled by the state that were normally used to house foreign Sufis, though these were counterbalanced from the beginning, and superseded from the end of the ninth/fifteenth century, by modest personal lodges (*zāwīyas*) of the *ṭarīqah* Sufis.⁷ In India, the political elites successfully extended their patronage to the Suhrawardīyah and, over time, even to the Chishtīyah, an order in which any form of contact with the state was strongly discouraged.⁸ In Asia Minor, the Ottomans, ever respectful of the Sufis, began to support the older Mevlevīye and the nascent Ḥalvetīye and Zeynīye extensively during the late ninth/fifteenth and early tenth/sixteenth centuries.⁹ Patronage by political elites was, however, only the most prominent sign of the spread of Sufi piety throughout Islamic societies of the Early Middle Period. Sufism gradually became a respectable, and even desirable, vocation among the cultural elites as a whole and emerged as an integral, perhaps the key, component of Islamic high culture. Having secured more than a firm foothold in upper urban society and its culture, it rapidly permeated all social and cultural strata, adapting to lower urban and rural culture with remarkable ease. Sufi piety thus emerged as a "mainstay of the international social order."¹⁰

DEVIANT RENUNCIATION AS A PROTEST AGAINST INSTITUTIONAL SUFISM

The growth of institutional Sufism produced a strong reaction from within its own ranks to the increasing this-worldliness of the *ṭarīqah* and the saint cult, which exhibited a considerable degree of accommodation with the ruling political and cultural elites. Growing institutionalization entailed the establishment and preservation of close ties with the wealthy and power-holding classes of society. Such worldly connections intensified the communal tendency within Sufism at the expense of its individualist core and increased the tension between its world-embracing and world-denying aspects. Ascetic renunciation, absorbed and domesticated by Sufism, now resurfaced

along the fault line created by this tension as a radical critique of co-opted Sufi religiosity. In this process, it joined forces with anarchist individualism, a latent but potent current within Sufism.

World-renouncing dervish groups were radical protest movements directed against medieval Islamic society at large but, more specifically, against the kindred but socially respectable institution of the *ṭarīqah*.¹¹ The tension between the dervish group and the Sufi *ṭarīqah* is well documented in the sources. The founder of the Qalandariyah himself, Jamāl al-Dīn Sāvī, was reacting against his own erstwhile Sufi training, which he apparently had received under his mainstream master ‘Uthmān Rūmī, when he broke away to embark on a distinctively ascetic saintly career. The story of his conversion to the path of renunciation leaves no doubt that he decisively rejected not only his Sufi past but, by all indications, a successful future as a Sufi master. And, as some reports suggest, he may have been denounced in the process by ‘Uthmān Rūmī. The same may have been true of Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar’s relationship with the Sufi master Luqmān-i Parandah. The hostile and aggressive behavior of some later Qalandars against reputed shaykhs of established Sufi *ṭarīqahs* such as the Suhrawardī Bahā’ al-Dīn Zakariyā and the Chishtī Farīd al-Dīn Ganj-i Shakar; their assassination attempts against the latter, Naṣīr al-Dīn Chirāgh-i Dihlī, and Ibrāhīm Gīlānī; and the openly contemptuous attitude of the Abdāl Otman Baba against all Sufi shaykhs demonstrate the explosive nature of the tension between ascetic renunciation and institutional Sufism. The reverse side of the coin was, of course, the summary and often angry dismissal of renouncers by many mainstream Sufis such as ‘Uthmān Rūmī, Ibrāhīm Gīlānī, and Muḥammad Gīsū’darāz, not to mention the Ottoman Vāhidī, who produced a book-length denunciation of deviant dervishes.

It is not enough to characterize the conflict between Sufi piety and dervish religiosity as simple mutual hostility, however. It would be more accurate to compare this relationship to the complex bond between “socially conformist” parents and their “rebellious” offspring. Thus, although the dervishes vociferously rejected the main features of institutional Sufism, in the final analysis they could not help but retain essentially Sufi beliefs and practices. The *ṭarīqah* determined the general pattern and shape of its shadow counterpart, the dervish group. The latter was a mirror image, in its negation, of the former.

Thus, the general structure of the loose dervish group, complete with eponymous master, actual leader, distinctive apparel, and paraphernalia as well as peculiar practices, reflected the structure of the *ṭarīqah*. Just as members of Sufi orders traced their spiritual lineage back to founding masters, the dervishes too harkened back to exemplary figures like Jamāl al-Dīn, Quṭb al-Dīn, and Otman Baba. As in the case of Ḥaydarīs, Jāmīs, Shams-i Tabrizīs, and Jalālīs, they were at times even known by the name of their founding fathers. Similarly, all major dervish groups were headed by elders experienced in the path of renunciation, so that the director-disciple relationship that was so central to the orders was reproduced in some fashion in dervish communities. Nor were the dervishes averse to constructing a socially visible group identity for themselves by means of distinctive clothing as well as the adoption of peculiar accoutrements. They even utilized, though naturally only after radical remodeling, time-honored Sufi options like the woolen habit, the dervish headgear (*tāf*), and the staff. Here their penchant to cultivate and preserve separate group affiliations clearly paralleled Sufi predilection for paying allegiance to distinct orders. Finally, although we are not well informed on dervish rites and rituals, it is likely that here too their practices mirrored, if only by contrast, those of the *ṭarīqahs*.

In the realm of ideas, the parentage of Sufism is equally obvious. The dervishes appropriated Sufi conceptual complexes like *faqr* (poverty), *fanā* (passing away of the self), and *walāyah* (sainthood), but applied extremist and radical interpretations to them. Indeed, the essential traits of dervish piety, asceticism, rejection of society, and uncompromising individualism can all be traced back, in theory if not always in practice, to such radical reinterpretations. The early Qalandars and probably the Ḥaydarīs, for instance, apparently worked the concept of poverty to its logical conclusions. The later Abdāls, for their part, were engrossed in their own understanding of *walāyah*, which in their eyes gave them license to reject the claims of Sufis to be the friends of God. Like many Sufis, most dervishes seem to have possessed the certainty of being infused with God's grace and provided typically Sufi explanations for this privilege.

The parent-offspring analogy can be pressed even further if we turn our attention to the question of recruitment to the path of renunciation. Close scrutiny of the biographies of prominent dervishes reveals a typical pattern: a male adult member of the cultural

elite (the same social stratum from which Sufism normally recruited), with a bright future in front of him if still young or a fairly distinguished career behind him if middle-aged or elderly, rejects his cultural status and becomes a dervish. A clear case in point is that of Jamāl al-Dīn Sāvī. The degree of learning that he displayed as a young man prior to his conversion, heavily emphasized in his sacred biography, is also attested by the fact that he was called "the walking library" as well as by his recorded attempt to compose at least a partial exegesis of the Qur'ān. The cases of the celebrated Persian poet Fakhr al-Dīn 'Irāqī, who joined the Qalandars as an impeccably educated young man of about seventeen years of age; the writer and poet Ḥamīd Qalandar (d. after 754/1353), who became a Qalandar in adolescence; the Ottoman Mevlānā Eşrefzāde Muhyiddīn Mehmed (fl. during the reign of Mehmed II), who gave up a life of religious scholarship in order to join a group of Qalandars; and the Ottoman poet Ḥayālī Beg (fl. first half of the tenth/sixteenth century) all conform to this pattern. Further instances of such, especially youthful, conversion from the elite to the dervish way of life are found in the biographies of the proto-Abdāls Baraḳ Baba, whose father was a military commander and uncle a famous clerk; Kaygusuz Abdāl (d. the first quarter of the ninth/fifteenth century), who was the son of a local ruler; Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar, said to be the son of a Turkish sultan; the Qalandar Khaṭīb Fārisī (d. after 748/1347-48), who converted to the Qalandarī path as a young man in search of wisdom and spiritual enlightenment; and the poet Ḥayretī, who chose the Abdāl path in his youth.

Our evidence suggests, therefore, that the architects and key personalities of dervish piety were mostly young dissenters from the elite. To judge by the examples enumerated, the precondition for becoming a dervish would appear to have been access, or guaranteed entry, to high culture. The direct connection between high culture and dervish piety is demonstrated both by the elite social background of prominent dervishes and by the presence of proficient poets and writers among them. In a similar vein, the veneration extended to dervishes by many a political ruler should be seen as further proof of the close ties between ascetic renunciation and elite culture. The examples of the Mamlūks al-Malik al-Zāhir and Kitbughā, who highly revered the Qalandarī leaders Muḥammad al-Balkhī and Ḥasan al-Jawālaqī, respectively; the Khaljī Firūz Shāh II in India, who

freely associated with Abū Bakr Ṭūsī Haydarī, and Ṭughril, the rebel governor of Bengal, who extended gifts to an anonymous Qalandar and his companions; and the Ottoman Murād II, who had a mosque built in Anatolia in the name of Sultān Ṣūcā', demonstrate that deviant dervishes exercised a degree of influence, probably owing to shared cultural origin, on power-holding classes. Deviant renunciation, it appears, took shape through the formative activities of dissenters from the cultural and political elite. In a very real sense, the dervishes were the offspring of socially respectable Sufis.¹²

At this point, it should no longer be surprising that youths seem to have been exceptionally responsive to the dervish calling or that the dervishes themselves apparently took a special interest in adolescents and young men. The story of Jamāl al-Dīn's conversion as a young man under the influence of a most peculiar boy called Jalāl al-Dīn Darguzīnī sets the tone in this regard. Thereafter, the Qalandars were frequently accused of attempting to entice children into adopting their own way of life, as attested, for instance, by the invective of the Chishtī Muḥammad Gīsū'darāz against them. Practically all of the examples of conversion to the dervish path enumerated above provide testimony to the validity of this claim. The irresistible pull of renunciation over young males is also recorded in the verses of Sa'dī:

Where there's a son who sits among the Qalandars
Tell the father he may wash his hands of any good for him;
Grieve not for his destruction, ruin:
Better that one disowned should die before his father!¹³

Much later, in Ottoman Anatolia, there were considerable numbers of learned youths as well as adolescents who specialized in serving hashish among the Abdāls, while the Jāmīs, themselves mostly young men of distinguished descent, paid special attention to men of the same age.

The new renunciation was, therefore, the offspring, in all senses of the word, of institutional Sufism. The two modes of piety were too intimately related to exist in continuous mutual antagonism. If the this-worldly orders were at times ready, out of not only political expediency but genuine attraction and sympathy, to accommodate their disturbingly antisocial counterparts within their own ranks, the deviant dervishes for their part, having manifested a considerable

degree of institutionalization from their very first days, were not always reluctant to be invested with a certain degree of social recognition. It may have been a combination of these two factors that lay behind the emergence of not only suborders such as the Chishtīyah-Qalandariyah in India but also antinomian orders such as the Bektāshīye in the Ottoman Empire. The accommodation of dervish piety by institutional Sufism was already signaled by the tolerant attitude of prominent orders' shaykhs such as Bahā' al-Dīn Zakariyā', Farid al-Dīn Ganj-i Shakar, and Naṣīr al-Dīn Chirāgh-i Dihlī toward the Qalandars, including even those who were downright hostile to them. In this connection, the fascination of celebrated Sufi poets with Qalandari themes, as attested by the numerous examples of *Qalandariyāt* in Arabic, Persian, and Turkish Sufi poetry, adequately demonstrates the attractive power that deviant rejection of society exercised on the hearts and minds of the Sufis. In spite of the verses of Sa'dī, Sufi parents could not totally disown their offspring. For their part, the latter could hardly resist the inexorable pull of institutionalization that operated within Sufism in particular and within Islamic societies in general. There were strong social pressures to conform to the formidable demand coming from political powers anxious to provide religious legitimacy to their sovereignty by safeguarding the *sharī'ah*. This was definitely the case in the Ottoman Empire, where the dervish groups must have felt the necessity to acquire sufficient respectability to avoid severe persecution by the state. Presumably, this problem was particularly acute for the Abdāls, who openly professed Shī'ī beliefs, probably as a result of their attempt to negate the dominant Sufi-Sunnī alliance within the empire. It is plausible, therefore, that they should, whether deliberately or in the course of time, have joined the ranks of the Bektāshīs, who were given official approval owing to their unbreachable connections with the backbone of the Ottoman army, the Janissaries. Other dervish groups, notably the Qalandars and Ḥaydarīs, followed suit. The definitive establishment of the great regional empires of the Ottomans, Ṣafavids, Ūzbeks, and Mughals during the tenth/sixteenth century led, therefore, to the return of the rebellious, if not prodigal, son to the household.

The Later Middle Period witnessed the spread and entrenchment of the new Islamic social institutions of the *ṭarīqah* and the *madrasah*. These institutions themselves were the products of momentous social

transformations that occurred in Islamdom in the Early Middle Period. From the perspective of this study, the most significant overall feature of this latter phase of Islamic history was the decisive triumph of this-worldly religiosity in the form of a powerful Sunnī-Sufi alliance. The decisive triumph of the communal tendency within Sufism as manifested in the establishment of the *ṭarīqahs* signaled the attenuation of its other-worldly dimensions. This forceful turn toward this-worldly piety generated a strong other-worldly reaction within Sufism by reactivating its latent renunciatory potentials. The ascetic and anarchist individualist trends gained renewed vigor and broke into the open as socially distinct movements of deviant renunciation. The institutional Sufism of the *ṭarīqahs* thus directly engendered and in the long run determined the nature and shape of the dervish group. The latter mirrored, in its very negation and if only in mockery, practically all aspects of the former. The relationship between the *ṭarīqah* and the dervish group was, nevertheless, not exclusively one of mutual antagonism. The institutionalization of Sufism did not mean the complete devaluation of the Sufi respect and admiration for the option of contemplative flight from the world, and many prominent Sufis looked upon the dervishes with sympathy and fascination. For their part, the dervishes could never completely sever the umbilical cord that connected them to Sufism. The volatile bond between the two related modes of piety thus remained operative in spite of the confrontational nature of the relationship between them.

· Middle
gnificant
: decisive
al Sunni-
y within
naled the
ful turn
reaction
ials. The
igor and
it renun-
y engen-
e of the
d if only
ationship
less, not
ation of
pect and
e world,
ympathy
mpletely
: volatile
operative
between

CHAPTER EIGHT

Conclusion

Intriguing in dress, behavior, and mode of piety, yet socially and legally marginal, the mendicant dervishes of Islamdom in the Later Middle Period have remained enigmatic figures for modern students of Islamic history. Little scholarly interest has been directed to them; by and large scholars have fallen victim to the temptation to view them through the distorting prism of "popular religion," an all-inclusive and ill-defined concept used to explain away religious phenomena resistant to the smooth application of simplistic models of Islamic religiosity. As a result of such neglect and carelessness, dervish piety has been obscured beyond recognition and generally ignored in favor of research into "mainstream" religious phenomena.

The history of the new renunciation as reconstructed here demonstrates clearly that what may from a distance appear to have been a confused and amorphous dervish movement in fact consisted of a set of clearly differentiated religious collectivities that maintained their distinct identities over time and space. In spite of a considerable degree of fluidity in appellation, the Qalandars, Haydarīs, Abdāls of Rūm, and others were essentially separate dervish groups. The uncontrolled ecstasy of the Abdāls of Rūm diverged considerably from the learned gaiety of the Jāmīs, while both of these groups stood quite apart from the fierce asceticism of the Haydarīs and the early Qalandars. The acknowledgment of the existence of noticeably demarcated currents of dervish piety does not, of course, imply that the lines of differentiation among different groups remained unchanged throughout the Later Middle Period and over a vast

geographical area of extreme cultural diversity. The suggestion is not that there was an unbridgeable separation among the groups that prevented interaction, interpenetration, or merger. In fact, it is highly likely, though impossible to document, that dervish bands heavily influenced each other. Rather, the argument is that there were, in any given temporally and spatially specific cultural sphere, several socially and ideally distinct types of dervish piety. Outsiders to dervish piety, Muslim and non-Muslim, frequently confused these types, yet the same cannot be said for the dervishes themselves, who appear to have been highly conscious of their own distinctive group identities.

The defining characteristic of dervish piety was socially deviant renunciation. Briefly, the adoption of the radically ascetic practices of poverty, mendicancy, itinerancy, celibacy, and self-inflicted pain can be understood properly only in the context of the dervishes' rejection of society, the basic institutions of which they regarded as unsuitable and uncondusive to other-worldly salvation. Thus salvation lay in active and socially conspicuous renunciation of society through uncompromisingly antisocial practices.

Renunciation was not particular to the Islamic Later Middle Period. High Caliphal times, usually and rightly portrayed as an intensely this-worldly phase of Islamic history, also generated powerful movements of other-worldly renunciation, which remained active through the Early Middle Period. The early ascetic movement of the first two Islamic centuries in the Fertile Crescent was followed by Karrāmīyah that spread chiefly in eastern Iran. In the long run, both of these movements were neutralized by the Sufi mode of piety, mainly because of its successful synthesis of other-worldly and this-worldly tendencies. Neutralization, however, did not entail destruction, and the legacy of asceticism remained potent within Sufism. In addition, Sufism itself carried the seeds of another, if related, kind of renunciation—anarchist individualism. The temptation for Sufis to cross the threshold between inner-worldly mystical activity and contemplative flight always remained close to the surface.

During the Early Middle Period, Sufism and Sunnism, now in close if not untroubled alliance, became the major constituents of the new Islamic social order that emerged after the disintegration of the universalist 'Abbāsid dispensation. The this-worldly potential of Sufism was actualized in full force and speed with the emergence of the Sufi *ṭarīqah* and the Sufi-colored institution of the cult of *awliyā'*

gestion is not groups that it, it is highly hands heavily were, in any several socially dervish piety, types, yet the appear to have entities.

cially deviant etic practices inflicted pain he dervishes' y regarded as . Thus salvation of society

Middle Period. s an intensely powerful move- active through of the first two y Karrāmīyah both of these piety, mainly d this-worldly struction, and a. In addition, d of renuncia- is to cross the contemplative

nism, now in stituents of the egration of the y potential of : emergence of cult of *awliyā*

throughout Islamdom. The entrenchment of Sufism in society in the form of ubiquitous social institutions refranchised the dormant other-worldly trends of renunciation and anarchist individualism within Sufism. While anarchist individualism surfaced early in the form of the literary and idealized Qalandar-topos, other-worldly trends soon won the day by harnessing anarchism and asceticism to the cause of renunciation. Deviant renunciation thus reclaimed its place on the agenda of Islamic religiosity as the active negation of institutional Sufism.

The relationship between institutional Sufism and dervish movements was a familial one. The latter emerged from the bosom of the former as rebel progeny who reflected, if negatively, the parent *ṭarīqahs*. The dervish groups closely resembled the Sufi orders in ideology and organization, if only in conscious mockery. The bond that held the two broad social collectivities together was, so to speak, organic so that their respective historical trajectories remained permanently intertwined. Where and whenever the *ṭarīqahs* entrenched themselves in the fabric of Islamic society, the other-worldly dervishes inevitably followed suit. Moreover, the relationship between Sufi and dervish piety was multidimensional. On both sides, antagonism was accompanied by respect, at times even admiration. In particular, the Sufis, in true this-worldly fashion, proved themselves to be sufficiently resilient to accommodate their rebellious brothers in their midst even beyond the ninth/fifteenth century during the period of the great regional empires.

Perhaps the most specific question that has arisen in the course of this study is one that can be dubbed the "ethnic connection." Thus, it is noteworthy that the movements of new renunciation arose primarily in the Iranian, Turkish, and Indian cultural spheres and that, conversely, there were no "indigenous" major dervish movements within predominantly Arab regions. Even the Qalandarīyah, although it took shape in the Fertile Crescent, remained a non-Arab, chiefly Iranian mode of piety, at least throughout the seventh-eighth/thirteenth-fourteenth centuries, and much the same can be said of the Haydarīyah during that period. Later, similar groups were active among non-Arab populations of the Ottoman Empire and northern India. It appears, therefore, that the new renunciation did not resonate with prevalent modes of religiosity in the Arab cultural spheres of Islamdom. In spite of similarities on the surface, the popular

Arab Sufi movements of the Rifā'iyyah, the Badawīyah, and, in the Maghrib, the 'Isāwah did not uphold the basic principles of deviant renunciation. These appear, rather, to have been regular *ṭarīqahs* that did not practice asceticism and antinomianism on a permanent basis and were not radical protest movements directed against Islamic society at large. The reasons behind such divergent development of piety within different cultural spheres must remain unexplored in this study. It is possible, of course, that closer scrutiny of the Arab scene in the Later Middle Period will modify and refine the picture drawn here.

A second question is whether the same forces that generated the movements of deviant renunciation from within institutional Sufism were not also at work in other aspects of Islamic religiosity during the same period. More specifically, it seems legitimate to inquire if the ascendancy of the *madrasah*, like that of the *ṭarīqah*, did not produce a reaction among the 'ulamā' against the increasing, or at the very least potential, this-worldliness of *madrasah*-piety. From this vantage-point, it is tempting to see just such a reaction in the lifelong religious activity of Ibn Taymiyah (d. 728/1328) and much later in the religious legacy of his Ottoman counterpart, Mehmed Birgivi (d. 981/1573). Both figures clashed all too frequently with socially respected and politically well-placed 'ulamā' precisely over issues that can be seen as measures of the degree of 'ulamā'-co-optation with society (namely, popular religion, especially the cult of *awliyā'*) and 'ulamā' willingness to exercise "extreme" flexibility on politically and socially sensitive issues.¹ The suggestion here is that there may be a connection between puritanical reformism as an intellectual current on the one hand and the thorough dominance of this-worldly piety among religious scholars on the other hand. This point clearly needs to be developed further and tested independently. In this connection, the idea of searching for critical reactions among the religious scholars to the entrenchment of the *madrasah* in Islamic society is certainly worthy of serious consideration.

A third and methodologically the most interesting question has to do with the social and economic factors behind the emergence and spread of the movements of new renunciation. On a general level, it is possible to associate ascetic world-rejection in premodern societies with urban as opposed to rural society. Renunciatory ideals were clearly the products of urban civilization.² The more meaningful

question, however, is whether one can go beyond such a simple correlation to assert the existence of a close connection between social prominence of religious ideals based on the concept of poverty on the one hand and the ascendancy of commercial capital within urban economies on the other. A strong argument along these lines has been elaborated for European history for the period between 1000 and 1300.³ Since the relative strength of merchant capital within the economies of Islamic societies especially during the High Caliphal and Early Middle Periods is a generally accepted feature of Islamic economic history, it seems possible to see the same connection between "voluntary poverty" and the "profit economy" operative throughout Islamic history as well. Once again, however, this must remain at best a tentative suggestion at this point.

Finally, the temporal correspondence between the rise of the mendicant orders, especially the Franciscans and Dominicans, in Europe and that of the dervish groups, in particular the Qalandars and Haydaris, in Islamdom makes one wonder if there was any connection between these two parallel developments. The question is highly intriguing, yet the absence of a critical mass of scholarly work on the economic history of Islamdom during the period in question makes it difficult if not impossible to answer. Recent work in world history suggests, however, that the possibility of unearthing such connections, at least on the economic level, between different cultural spheres is a real one and should be borne in mind in future research directed to this issue.⁴

Given that so many Muslim individuals actually converted to the dervish way of life during the Later Middle Period, the modern historian of religion has the responsibility to approach this phenomenon with genuine concern and respect. The temptation to explain dervish piety away as being peculiar to "less capable" members of Islamic society should be resisted. If nothing else, this study demonstrates clearly that such basic respect for the human subjects of historical study inevitably opens up new and fruitful avenues of research.

The attempt to retrace the historical trajectory of the dervish groups has led us through all major cultural spheres of Islamdom in the Later Middle Period. The true nature and significance of the Qalandars and the Haydaris as well as of the culturally more specific groups like the Abdals of Rüm, Jämîs, Madâris, and Jalâlis emerged

only after such a broad cross-cultural investigation. Notwithstanding the crucial role of culturally and regionally restricted case studies, it should now be obvious that there is a distinct need to adopt holistic inclusive perspectives in the study of the history of premodern Islamic religion.

In a similar vein, the results of a close scrutiny of dervish piety contain a strong warning against the scholarly tendency to avoid what are generally assumed to be "marginal" religious phenomena. This inquiry into "marginal" dervish groups leads to a new understanding of the place of renunciatory trends in the history of Islamic religion in general and within Sufism in particular. Moreover, it casts new light on Sufism itself, which can now be viewed as the successful development of a this-worldly mystical piety within Islam. Nothing, it appears, is marginal in the history of religions.

Abbreviations

Abdāl	Küçük Abdāl. <i>Velāyetnâme-i Sultân Otman Baba</i> . Ms. Adnan Ötügen İl Halk Kütüphanesi (Ankara), no. 495, dated 1316/1899. Copyist Hasan Tebrizi.
Aflākī	Shams al-Dīn Ahmad al-ʿArifi al-Aflākī. <i>Manāqib al-ʿarifin</i> . Edited by Tahsin Yazıcı.
ʿĀşık	ʿĀşık Çelebi. <i>Meşāʾirüʾş-şuʿarā or Tezkere of ʿĀşık Çelebi</i> . Edited by G. H. Meredith-Owens.
Ayverdi Baranī	Ekrem Hakkı Ayverdi. <i>Osmanlı Mimârisinin İlk Devri</i> . Ziyâʾ al-Dīn Baranī. <i>Tārīkh-i Firūz-Shāhī</i> . Edited by Saiyid Ahmad Khān.
Battūtāh	Ibn Battūtāh. <i>Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah [Tuhfat al-nuzzār fī gharāʾib al-amṣār wa ʿajāʾib al-asfār]</i> . Edited by C. Defrémery and B. R. Sanguinetti.
Dhahabī	Shams al-Dīn Abū ʿAbd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ʿUthmān al-Dimashqī al-Dhahabī. <i>Tārīkh al-islām</i> , Part 63 (years 621-30). Edited by Bashshār ʿAwār Maʾrūf, Shuʿayb al-Arnaʿūt, and Ṣāliḥ Mahdī ʿAbbās.
Digby	Simon Digby. "Qalandars and Related Groups: Elements of Social Deviance in the Religious Life of the Delhi Sultanate of the 13th and 14th Centuries." In <i>Islam in South Asia</i> , vol. 1, <i>South Asia</i> , edited by Yohanan Friedmann, 60-108.
Dihkhudā	ʿAlī Akbar Dihkhudā. <i>Lughātnāmah</i> .
EI	<i>The Encyclopaedia of Islam</i> , new edition.
EIR	<i>Encyclopaedia Iranica</i> .
Ergun 1	Sadeddin Nüzhet Ergun. <i>Bektaşî Edebiyatı Antolojisi: Bektaşî Şairleri ve Nefesleri</i> .
Ergun 2	Sadeddin Nüzhet Ergun. <i>Türk Şairleri</i> .
Evliyâ	Evliyâ Çelebi. <i>Evliyâ Çelebi Seyâhatnâmesi</i> . Edited by Ahmed Cevdet and Necib ʿAşım.
Fārisī	Khaṭīb Fārisī. <i>Manāqib-i Jamāl al-Dīn Sāvī</i> . Edited by Tahsin Yazıcı. A later edition: <i>Qalandarnāmah-i Khaṭīb Fārisī yâ Sūrat-i Jamāl al-Dīn Sāvajī</i> . Edited by Hamid Zarrinkūb.
Gölpınarlı	Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı. <i>Mevlânâdan Sonra Mevlevîlik</i> .
Gramlich	Richard Gramlich. <i>Die Schiitischen Derwischorden Persiens</i> .
Hodgson	Marshall G. S. Hodgson. <i>The Venture of Islam: Conscience and History in a World Civilization</i> .
Jawbarī	ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Dimashqī al-Jawbarī. <i>Kitāb al-mukhtār fī kashf al-asrār wa-hatā al-astār</i> . Ms. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), Karaçelebizade 253, dated 717/1317-18.

- Karbalā'ī Ibn Karbalā'ī, Hāfiẓ Husayn Karbalā'ī Tabrizī. *Rawzat al-jinān va jannāt al-janān*. Edited by Ja'far Sulṭān al-Qurrā'ī.
- Khaṭīb Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Khaṭīb. *Fuṣṭāṭ al-'adālah fi qawā'id al-salṭanah*. Edited by Osman Turan, "Selçuk Türkiyesi din tarihine dair bir kaynak: Fuṣṭāṭ ul-'adāle fi qawā'id is-salṭana," 553-64 (Persian text). In 60. *Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Fuad Köprülü Armağanı*, 531-64.
- Kınalızāde Kınalızāde Ḥasan Çelebi. *Tezkiretü's-su'arā*. Edited by İbrahim Kutluk.
- Köprülü 1 Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. "Anadolu'da İslāmīyet: Türk istilāsından sonra Anadolu tārīḥ-i dīnīsine bir nazar ve bu tārīḥiñ menba'ları." *Dāri'l-fünūn Edebiyāt Fakültesi Mecmū'ası* 2 (1922-23): 281-311, 385-420, 457-86.
- Köprülü 2 Mehmed Fuad Köprülü. *Türk Halkedebiyatı Ansiklopedisi*.
- Laṭīfī 'Abdullaṭīf Çelebi Laṭīfī. *Tezkire*.
- Meier Fritz Meier. *Abū Sa'id-i Abū l-Ḥayr (357-440/967-1049): Wirklichkeit und Legende*.
- Menavino Giovan Antonio Genovese da Vultri Menavino. *Trattato de costumi et vita de Turchi*. German translation: *Türkische Historien: von der Türcken Ankunfft, Regierung, Königen und Kaisern, Kriegen, Schlachten, Victorien und Sigen, wider Christen und Heiden*. . . . Translated by Heinrich Müller.
- Nicolas Nicolas de Nicolay Daulphinois, Seigneur d'Arfeuille. *Les navigations, peregrinations et voyages, faicts en la Turquie, par Nicolas de Nicolay*. . . . English translation: *The Navigations, Peregrinations and Voyages, Made into Turkie by Nicholas Nicholay Daulphinois*. . . . Translated by T. Washington the Younger.
- Nişancı Ramāzānzāde Nişancı Mehmed, known as Küçük Nişancı. *Tārīḥ-i Nişancı Mehmed Paşa*.
- Nizami Khaliq Ahmad Nizami. *Some Aspects of Religion and Politics in India during the Thirteenth Century*.
- Nu'aymī 'Abd al-Qādir al-Nu'aymī. *Al-dāris fi ta'rīkh al-madāris*. Edited by Ja'far al-Ḥasanī.
- Ocak Ahmet Yaşar Ocak. *Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda Marjinal Süfilik: Kalenderiler (XIV-XVII. Yüzyıllar)*.
- Pouzet Louis Pouzet. *Damas au VI^e/XIII^e siècle: Vie et structures religieuses d'une métropole islamique*.
- Qalandar Ḥamīd Qalandar. *Khayr al-majālis: Malfūzāt-i Ḥazrat-i Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, Chirāgh-i Dihlī*. Edited by Khaliq Ahmad Nizami.
- Qazwīnī Zakariyā' Muḥammad al-Qazwīnī. *Āthār al-bilād wa-akhbār al-'ibād*.
- Ritter Helmut Ritter. *Das Meer der Seele: Mensch, Welt und Gott in den Geschichten des Farīduddīn 'Attār*.
- Rizvi Saiyid Athar Abbas Rizvi. *A History of Sufism in India*. Vol. 1, *Early Sufism and Its History in India to 1600 A.D.*
- Rosenthal Franz Rosenthal. *The Herb: Hashish versus Medieval Muslim Society. Studia Islamica*.
- Şafadī Şalāḥ al-Dīn Khalīl ibn Aybak al-Şafadī. *al-Wāfi bi-al-wafayāt*. Vol. 5. Edited by Sven Dederling.

at al-jinān va

ālāh fi qawā'id
yesi dīn tari-
ma," 553-64
uad Köprülü

by İbrahim

istilāsından
menba'ları." 3): 281-311,

disi.

9): Wirklich-

ato de costumi
Historien: von
sm, Kriegen,
Heiden. . . .

lle. Les navi-
ar Nicolas de
Peregrinations
Daulphinois.

işāncı. Tārīḡ-

nd Politics in

is. Edited by

jinal Sūfilik:

res religieuses

rat-i Shaykh
valiq Ahmad

va-akhbār al-

i Gott in den

ndia. Vol. 1,

Islam Society.

wafayāt. Vol.

Storey

Charles Ambrose Storey. *Persian Literature: A Bio-bibliographical Survey*. Vol. 1, pt. 2, *Biography*.

Suhrawardī

Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar al-Suhrawardī, 'Awārif al-ma'ārif. German translation: *Die Gaben der Entkenntnisse des 'Umar as-Suhrawardī* ('Awārif al-ma'ārif). Translated by Richard Gramlich. *Türk Ansiklopedisi*.

TA

Trimingham

J. Spencer Trimingham. *The Sufi Orders in Islam*.

Vāhidī

Vāhidī. *Menākīb-i Ḥvoca-i Cihān ve Netīce-i Cān*. In Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *Vāhidī's Menākīb-i Ḥvoca-i Cihān ve Netīce-i Cān: Critical Edition and Analysis*, 88-293.

Yemīnī

Yemīnī. *Fazāletnāme-i emirū'l-mū'minūn 'Alī*. Edited by Ahmed Ḥızır.

Zarrīnkūb

'Abd al-Ḥusayn Zarrīnkūb. "Ahl-i malāmat va rāh-i Qalandar." *Majallah-i Dānishkadah-i Adabiyāt va 'Ulūm-i Insānī* (Tehran) 22 (1354sh/1975): 61-100.

Notes

1. INTRODUCTION

1. Muḥammad ibn Maṣṣūr Mubārak-Shāh, known as Fakhr-i Mudabbir, *Ādāb al-ḥarb wa al-shajā'ah*, ed. Aḥmad Suhaylī Khvānsārī, 446-47; Meier, 511, n. 250.

2. Hamid Algar, "Barāq Bābā," in *EIR*, 3:754-55. Barak Baba is discussed in chapter 5 below.

3. Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo, *Clavijo: Embassy to Tamerlane 1403-1406*, trans. Guy Le Strange, 139-40.

4. The periodization of Islamic history follows Hodgson, especially 1:96. Hodgson's scheme in C.E. dates is as follows: Late Sāsānī and Primitive Caliphal Periods, ca. (485)-692; High Caliphal Period, ca. 692-945; Earlier Middle Islamic Period, ca. 945-1258; Later Middle Islamic Period, ca. 1258-1503; Period of Gunpowder Empires, ca. 1503-1789; Modern Technical Age, ca. 1789-present.

5. This section has been adopted with extensive changes from Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "The Antinomian Dervish as Model Saint," in *Modes de transmission de la culture religieuse en Islam*, ed. Hassan Elboudrari, 241-60.

6. Notable studies on the Qalandars are Mahammad Tagi Ahmad, "Who Is a Qalandar?" *Journal of Indian History* 33 (1955): 155-70; Digby; Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı, "Kalenderiye," in *TA*, 21:157-61; Meier, 494-516; Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, "Kalenderiler ve Bektaşılık," in *Doğumunun 100. yılında Atatürk'e Armağan*, 297-308; idem, "Quelques remarques sur le rôle des derviches kalenderis dans les mouvements populaires et les activités anarchiques aux XV^e et XVI^e siècles dans l'empire Ottoman," *Osmanlı Araştırmaları* 3 (1982): 69-80; Ocak; Tahsin Yazıcı, "Kalandar" and "Kalandariyya," in *EI*, 4:472-74; and Zarrīnkūb, esp. 78-92 (also on Ḥaydarīs), reprinted in idem, *Justujū dar taṣavvuf-i Irān*, esp. 359-75. The Ḥaydarīs and Abdāls of Rūm are discussed in passing on many occasions in the larger works of Mehmed Fuad Köprülü and Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı cited later in this work and in the works of Ocak cited above (Ocak relies largely on Köprülü and Gölpınarlı).

7. Ocak is the most comprehensive existing study. Ocak prefaces his study with a long coverage of renunciatory trends (which he collectively labels "Kalenderilik") in Islamic history up to the eighth/fourteenth century and maintains a broad definition of renunciation throughout the book. He does not, however, identify new renunciation as a distinct phase in the history of Islamic religiosity and, further, limits his focus to the Ottoman Empire. Ocak's study came to my attention after the completion of the present monograph.

8. Jawbarī, fols. 17b-18a. Al-Jawbarī's account of Qalandars and Ḥaydarīs is paraphrased in chapter 5 below.

9. See chapter 5, note 3, for full documentation.

10. Khaṭīb, 531-64 (Persian text on 553-64); praise for the Mongols is on 53b.
11. See chapter 5, notes 24 and 44, respectively.
12. Vāhidī, fols. 52a-52b.
13. Laṭīfī, 110 (biography of the poet Temennāyī).
14. On the word *torlak*, "beardless, handsome youth," see Gerard Clauson, *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*, 546, col. ii; and Ettore Rossi, "'Torlak' kelimesine dair," *Türk Dili Araştırmaları Yıllığı-Belleten* (1955): 9-10.
15. Menavino, 79-82; German translation, 36b-37b. Menavino spent some years in Istanbul during the reigns of the Ottoman sultans Bāyezīd II (r. 886-918/1481-1512) and Selīm I (r. 918-26/1512-20).
16. Edward William Lane, *Manners and Customs of the Modern Egyptians*, 234. Lane resided in Cairo from 1825 to 1828 and 1833 to 1835.
17. Köprülü 1, 299-300 (the last sentence is from n. 1 on 300). Cf. English translation: *Islam in Anatolia after the Turkish Invasion (Prolegomena)*, trans. and ed. Gary Leiser, 12-13 and n. 41 (70).
18. Fazlur Rahman, *Islam*, 153.
19. For a critical discussion on the "two-tiered model of religion," see Peter Brown, *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*, 12-22. A comprehensive review of the use of the concept of popular religion in religious studies is found in Catherine Bell, "Religion and Chinese Culture: Toward an Assessment of 'Popular Religion,'" *History of Religions* 29 (1989): 35-57. Ernest Gellner, "Flux and Reflux in the Faith of Men," in *Muslim Society*, 1-85, is an interesting attempt to remedy the psychologistic bias of the two-tiered model of religion as found in the thought of David Hume through a merger with the sociological models of Ibn Khaldūn, though Gellner's own explanatory model is, curiously, also ahistorical. For a classical treatment of Islamic religiosity on the basis of the two-tiered model ("polytheistic needs within monotheism"), see Ignaz Goldziher, "Veneration of Saints in Islam," in *Muslim Studies*, ed. S. M. Stern, trans. C. R. Barber and S. M. Stern, 2:255-341. A recent reevaluation of the two-tiered model of culture in the medieval Islamic context is Boaz Shoshan, "High Culture and Popular Culture in Medieval Islam," *SA* 73 (1991): 67-107.
20. Ira M. Lapidus, *A History of Islamic Societies*, 162.
21. It is symptomatic of the thoroughly ahistorical conception of popular religion that the argument as presented here is less a summary of well-developed views on the subject in secondary literature, which are not in evidence, than a fresh construction from clues and implicit assumptions found in scholarly accounts of a general nature. See, for example, Rahman, *Islam*, 153-56.
22. On the question of survival and influence, especially in regard to Central Asian shamanism and South Asian Hindu and Buddhist asceticism, see, for instance, Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, *Influence du chamanisme turco-mongol sur les ordres mystiques musulmans*; Emel Esin, "'Eren': Les derviş hétérodoxes turcs d'Asie centrale et le peintre surnommé 'Siyāh-Kālam,'" *Turcica* 17 (1985): 7-41; and Digby, 66. The following description of the Śaivite Kāpālika ascetics, so similar in appearance to deviant dervishes, nicely demonstrates why the theory of survival or influence can be so tempting: "They wander about with a skull begging bowl, their bodies smeared with ashes, wearing bone or skull ornaments and loincloths of animal skin, with their hair matted in matted locks. They sometimes carry a special club . . . consisting of a skull mounted on a stick" (David N. Lorenzen, "Śaivism: Kāpālikas," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*,

13:19). Similarity in physical appearance, however, does not entail similarity in belief and practice: a closer look at Kāpālikas reveals the difficulties of comparing them to Muslim dervishes; see David N. Lorenzen, *The Kāpālikas and Kālāmukhas: Two Lost Śaivite Sects*.

2. RENUNCIATION THROUGH SOCIAL DEVIANCE

1. Dihkhudā, s.v. "Darvish." Duncan Black Macdonald, "Darwīsh," in *EI*, 2:164–65, is devoid of interest. On the Arabic term *faqīr*, see Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, "Faḳīr," in *EI*, 2:757–78.

2. All three ascetic virtuosi mentioned here are discussed in detail with references in chapter 4 below, where information utilized in the present discussion is properly documented.

3. The sacred biography of Jamāl al-Dīn Sāvī, composed in 748/1347–48 by a Qalandar, is explicit on this point; see Fārisī; exact page references to the topic of poverty in this work are given in chapter 4, note 8.

4. Vāhidī, fol. 43a.

5. Chapter 12 of the Qurʾān is devoted to Yūsuf. Incidentally, it is impossible to tell if Jamāl al-Dīn's continence was accompanied by misogyny, as was the case in early Christian asceticism in Egypt; see Peter Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*, 241–58.

6. Cf. Giles Constable, *Attitudes toward Self-Inflicted Suffering in the Middle Ages*, 11.

7. The domestication of asceticism by Sufism during the High Caliphal Period (ca. 692–945 C.E.) is discussed below in chapter 3.

8. Richard Gramlich, "Madjdihūb," in *EI*, 5:1029; Michael W. Dols, Majnūn: *The Madman in Medieval Islamic Society*, ed. Diana E. Immisch, 388–410.

9. Fārisī, Yazıcı's edition, 33, line 3 (Jamāl al-Dīn and Jalāl Darguzīnī), and 71, line 17 (Muḥammad Balkhī); Zarrīnkūb's edition, verses 708 and 1389, respectively; Abdāl, several references to ritual prayer, for instance fol. 54a.

10. Algar, "Barāq Bābā," 754.

11. The Qalandarī author Khaṭīb Fārisī ends each section of the *Manāqib* with the refrain "come let us abandon this world / [and] utter a *takbīr* in the fashion of Qalandars" (*bi-yā tā dast az īn ʿālam bi-shūʾim / qalandarvār takbīrī bi-gūʾim*). The Abdāls, for their part, "uttered four *takbīrs* at the times of the five daily prayers and did not take ablutions or await the prayer-call or heed the prayer leader" (ʿĀṣīḳ, fol. 175a). Although *takbīr* figures prominently in all Islamic rituals, the reference here is clearly to the fourfold *takbīr* of the funeral prayer that is performed standing up, with no prostrations.

12. On the dress codes endorsed by the *sunnah*, see, for instance, Muḥammad al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Arabic-English bilingual ed. by Muḥammad Muḥsin Khān, 7:454–551 (Book 72: The Book of Dress). On Islamic costume in general, see Yedida K. Stillman, Norman A. Stillman, and T. Majda, "Libās," in *EI*, 5:732–53. Discussions on proper apparel appear in major Sufi manuals; see, for instance, ʿAlī ibn ʿUthmān al-Jullābī al-Hujwīrī, *The Kashf al-Mahjūb: The Oldest Persian Treatise on Sufism by al-Hujwīrī*, trans. Reynold A. Nicholson, 45–57; also Suhrawardī, 318–24 (chapter 44); German translation, 306–11. On Sufi headgear, see John Brown, *The Darvishes or Oriental Spiritualism*, ed. H. A. Rose, 57–62; and Theodor Menzel, "Beiträge zur Kenntnis der Derwisch-täg," in *Festschrift Georg Jacob*, ed. Theodor Menzel, 174–99. For an attempt to trace the origins of

Sufi and dervish costume, see Geo Widengren, "Harlekintracht und Mönchskutte, Clownhut und Derwischmütze," *Orientalia Suecana* 2 (1953): 41-111.

13. See, for instance, al-Bukhārī, *Ṣaḥīḥ*, 7:514 and 517 (Book 72, reports 63 and 65, respectively).

14. See M. C. Lyons, "A Note on the *Maqāma* Form," *Pembroke Papers* 1 (1990): 117, for references to instances of shaving the beard as "a disgrace inflicted on drugged opponents by the man of wiles" in medieval Arabic popular literature (*Sīrat Ḥamzah*, *Sīrat Baybars*, and *Sīrat Dhāt al-Himmah*) as well as in the *Maqāmah* of Saymarah of Badī' al-Zamān al-Hamadhānī (d. 398/1008). Cf. Widengren, "Harlekintracht," 51, n. 3.

15. On shaving in Sufism, see Gramlich, 1:88, and the references quoted there. Although the dervishes seem to have left behind a short composition of about seventy-five verses in Persian called *Tarāshnāmah*, there is no agreement among scholars on its authorship: E. E. Bertels, "Le Tarāsh-nāma: Un poème didactique des dervishes Jalālī," *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de l'URSS* (1926): 35-38, as reported by Gramlich (bibliography), apparently attributes it to the Jalālī dervishes, while Gölpınarlı, 140, thinks that the work was composed by the Shams-i Tabrizī poet Ṣāhidī (d. 957/1550). The *Tarāshnāmah*, which survives in many manuscripts (see, for instance, Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi [Istanbul], Ms. Hacı Mahmud 3843/3, fols. 7a-9b), does not reveal anything new on the practice of shaving.

16. The discovery of the "elevating" effects of cannabis leaves by Quṭb al-Dīn is reported by 'Imād al-Dīn Abū al-Faḍl al-Hasan al-'Uqbārī (possibly d. 690/1291), *Kitāb al-sawānīḥ al-adabīyah fī al-madā'ir al-qinnabīyah*, reproduced in Rosenthal, 51-53. Muḥammad ibn Bahādur al-Zarkashī, *Zahr al-'arīsh fī aḥkām (or taḥrīm) al-hashīsh*, text in Rosenthal, 177, has a shorter report to the same effect, where Jamāl al-Dīn is also mentioned as Aḥmad al-Sāwajī al-Qalandarī.

17. The most explicit description of the consumption of hashish in a ritual setting by dervishes is found in Menavino's account on Abdāls of Rūm, Menavino, 76-79; see chapter 6 for a complete translation of this account into English.

18. On the legal prohibition of wine, see Arent Jan Wensinck, "Khamr, I. Juridical Aspects," in *EI*, 4:994-97. The legal and social implications of the use of hallucinogens is discussed in Rosenthal.

19. Jean-Louis Michon, "Sacred Music and Dance in Islam," in *Islamic Spirituality: Manifestations*, ed. Seyyid Hossein Nasr, 469-505; Jean During, *Musique et extase: L'Audition mystique dans la tradition soufie*; Marijan Molé, "La danse extatique en Islam," in *Les danses sacrées*, 145-280; Fritz Meier, "Der Derwisch Tanz: Versuch eines Überblicks," *Asiatische Studien* 1-4 (1954): 107-36.

20. On sodomy and homosexuality in Islamic history, see "Liwāt," in *EI*, 5:776-79 (written by the editors).

21. On *mūtū qabla an tamūtū*, see 'Alī Akbar Dihkhudā, *Kitāb-i amṣāl wa ḥikam*, 4:1753; Badī' al-Zamān Furūzānfar, *Aḥādīth-i Maṣnavī*, 116, no. 353; and Ritter, 583.

22. The biography of Jamāl al-Dīn, as reported in various sources, contains ample demonstration of this predilection for graveyards. In particular, his hagiography has one whole section on this subject, entitled "Dalīl guftan-i Sayyid dar bāb-i ānkih dar gūristān nishastan[rā] martabah chūst": see Fārisī, Yazıcı's edition, 82, line 1, to 85, line 5; Zarrīnkūb's edition, verses 1609-68. The location of later Qalandar centers in Cairo and Jerusalem within or in the vicinity of cemeteries was no doubt a legacy of Jamāl al-Dīn. Practicing retreats

in cemeteries was not, of course, particular to Qalandars: Ibn al-ʿArabī (d. 638/1240), for instance, a contemporary of Jamāl al-Dīn, is known to have followed this practice; see Michel Chodkiewicz, *Le sceau des saints: Prophétie et sainteté dans la doctrine d'Ibn Arabi*, 16.

23. On "looking at beardless boys," *naẓar ilā al-murd* in Arabic and *shāhidbāzī* in Persian, see Ritter, 459-77. A clear condemnation of the practice by a Sufi is in al-Jullābī, *Kashf al-Mahjūb*, 416-17; for a non-Sufi counterpart, see ʿAbd al-Rahmān ibn ʿAlī ibn al-Jawzī, *Talbīs Iblīs*, 264-78. Cf. Peter Lamborn Wilson, *Scandal: Essays in Islamic Heresy*, 93-121.

24. Alessandro Bausani, "Hurūfiyya," in *EI*, 3:600-601; and Abdūlbakī Gölpinarlı, *Hurufilik Metinleri Kataloğu*.

25. The way of renunciation naturally remained as an option that could be adopted for reasons other than the achievement of spiritual enlightenment. As Digby observes, for instance, "the garb and personal appearance of a Qalandar might be adopted by an educated man as a matter of choice, one might almost say affectation" (Digby, 71). To the example of Malik Saʿd al-Dīn Mantiqī that Digby adduces in this context, one might add that of Mawlanā Mīr Jamāl, a renowned logician and mathematician: the story of his entertaining confrontation with the Naqshbandī master Khvājah ʿUbayd Allāh Ahrār (806-96/1403-90) is narrated by Fakhr al-Dīn ʿAlī ibn Ḥusayn Vāʾiz Kāshifī, *Rashaḥāt ʿayn al-ḥayāt*, ed. ʿAlī Aṣghar Muʿīniyān, 2:643-45.

3. RENUNCIATION, DEVIANT INDIVIDUALISM, AND SUFISM

1. The source of inspiration here is Max Weber, "Religious Rejections of the World and Their Directions," in *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*, trans. and ed. H. H. Gerth and C. Wright Mills, 323-59. See Said Amir Arjomand, *The Shadow of God and the Hidden Imam: Religion, Political Order, and Societal Change in Shi'ite Iran from the Beginning to 1890*, 16-18, for illuminating observations on Weber's discussion.

2. The Qurʾān, 10:7-8 and 24; 11:15-16; 13:26; 14:3; 16:107; 18:45-46; 20:131; 27:60; 29:64; 40:39; 42:34; 57:20. These verses emphasize the superiority of life in the hereafter over life in this world, which is described as temporary amusement and play.

3. The relevant verses would be too numerous to list here. A concise and clear exposition of the this-worldly nature of the Qurʾānic message appears in Fazlur Rahman, *Major Themes of the Qurʾān*, 37-64.

4. Leah Kinberg, "Compromise of Commerce: A Study of Early Traditions concerning Poverty and Wealth," *Der Islam* 66 (1989): 193-212, nicely demonstrates the pliability of the *sunnah*.

5. Emile Tyan, "Djihād," in *EI*, 2:538-40.

6. Michael Cook, *Early Muslim Dogma: A Source-Critical Study*, 43. Wilferd Madelung, "Murjīʿa," in *EI*, 7:605, rightly points out, however, that political quietism was not a necessary component of the Murjīʿī movement and that many Murjīʿīs were politically active.

7. Mahmood Ibrahim, *Merchant Capital and Islam*; Maxime Rodinson, *Islam and Capitalism*, trans. Brian Pearce; Shelomo Dov Goitein, "The Rise of the Near-Eastern Bourgeoisie in Early Islamic Times," *Journal of World History* 3

(1956): 583-604. The significance of merchant capital for religious scholarship is demonstrated in Hayyim J. Cohen, "The Economic Background and the Secular Occupations of Muslim Jurisprudents and Traditionists in the Classical Period of Islam (until the Middle of the Eleventh Century)," *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 13 (1970): 16-61. The role of commerce in the formation of Islamic cities is studied in Hughes Kennedy, "From Polis to Medina: Urban Change in Late Antique and Early Islamic Syria," *Past & Present* 106 (1985): 3-27.

8. Muhammad Hashim Kamali, *Principles of Islamic Jurisprudence*, 168-96; George F. Hourani, "The Basis of Authority of Consensus in Sunnite Islam," *SA* 16 (1962): 13-40, reprinted in *Reason and Tradition in Islamic Ethics*, 190-226; M. Bernand, "Idjmā", in *EI*, 3:1023-26; Wael B. Hallaq, "On the Authoritativeness of Sunni Consensus," *International Journal of Middle East Studies* 18 (1986): 427-54. On authority in Sunni Islam, also see Hamid Dabashi, *Authority in Islam: From the Rise of Muhammad to the Establishment of the Umayyads*, 71-93; and the relevant chapters in George Makdisi, Dominique Sourdel, and Janine Sourdel-Thomine, eds., *La notion d'autorité au Moyen Age: Islam, Byzance, Occident*.

9. It is possible to argue that Hanbalism was the epitome of the attitude that privileged the community: see George Makdisi, "Hanbalite Islam," in *Studies on Islam*, ed. Merlin L. Swartz, 216-74, esp. 251-64.

10. For detailed discussion of early Islamic asceticism, see Ignaz Goldziher, "Asceticism and Sufism," in *Introduction to Islamic Theology and Law*, trans. Andras Hamori and Ruth Hamori, 116-34; Tor Andrae, *In the Garden of Myrtles: Studies in Early Islamic Mysticism*, trans. Birgitta Sharpe, 33-71; Arthur John Arberry, *Sufism: An Account of the Mystics of Islam*, 31-44; and Leah Kinberg, "What Is Meant by Zuhd?" *SA* 61 (1985): 27-44.

11. On the transition to the *tawakkul* era, see Benedikt Reinert, *Die Lehre vom tawakkul in der klassischen Sufik*.

12. Goitein, "Rise of the Near-Eastern Bourgeoisie," 586-87.

13. Kinberg, "Compromise of Commerce," argues that "renunciation of worldly goods was always the main current in Islam, and [that] traditions [that is, *hadith*] favoring property and wealth arose only as a concession to the rising economic power of the bourgeoisie" (195).

14. Goldziher, "Asceticism and Sufism," 130-31. Julian Baldick's recent survey, *Mystical Islam: An Introduction to Sufism*, demonstrates that the concern with external influences, which has a long history, continues to remain on the agenda.

15. Andras Hamori, "Ascetic Poetry (*Zuhdiyyāt*)," in *The Cambridge History of Arabic Literature: 'Abbasid Belles-Lettres*, ed. Julia Ashtiany et al., 265-74.

16. For the expression "inner-worldly mysticism," see Weber, "Religious Rejections," 325-26.

17. Discussions on the subject of gainful employment and the relative merits of poverty and wealth appear in all major Sufi manuals under various headings. For a good example of the this-worldly trend noted here, see al-Jullābī, *Kashf al-Mahjūb*, 19-29 and 58-61.

18. See, for instance, the discussion on seclusion in Hermann Landolt, "Khalwa," in *EI*, 4:990-91.

19. Jacqueline Chabbi, "Khānqāh," in *EI*, 4:1025-26.

20. On *Malāmatīyah*, see Hamid Algar, Frederick de Jong, and Colin Imber, "Malāmatīyya," in *EI*, 6:223-28; and Sara Sviri, "Ḥakīm Tirmidhī and the

Mi
to
Bc
Tr
fut
im

Su
mo
ide
37
Isl

ho
exj
3:7

go
dju

dir
pre

this
der

anc
Per

the
Mr

tim
Ral

i si
197

qar
see:

the
unl

3:1
pos

plai
thai

firq
qak

Do
sur

or
unc

den

Azi

Malāmātī Movement in Early Sufism, in *Classical Persian Sufism: From Its Origins to Rumi*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn, 583-613. On Karrāmīyah, see Clifford Edmund Bosworth, "Karrāmīyya," in *EI*, 4:667-69; and Wilferd Madelung, *Religious Trends in Early Islamic Iran*, 39-53. The most comprehensive treatment of *futuwwah*, with copious references, is Franz Taeschner, *Zünfte und Bruderschaften im Islam: Texte zur Geschichte der Futuwwa*.

21. For comparative treatment of Malāmātīyah, Karrāmīyah, and "Irāqī" Sufism, see Jacqueline Chabbi, "Remarques sur le développement historique des mouvements ascétiques et mystiques au Khurasan," *SA* 46 (1977): 5-72; and idem, "Réflexions sur le soufisme iranien primitif," *Journal Asiatique* 266 (1978): 37-55. Cf. Richard W. Bulliet, *The Patricians of Nishapur: A Study in Medieval Islamic Social History*, 41-46.

22. This is clearly a "sociological" interpretation of the concept, which, however, was not absent from Sufi understanding of *baqā'*. For the standard experiential interpretations, see Gerhard Böwering, "Baqā' and Fanā'," in *EIR*, 3:722-24.

23. Suhrawardī, 84-86; German translation, 93-94 (chapter 10, 16-20).

24. "With regard to personal progress, . . . the word of the Prophet holds good: 'One single attraction by God is equivalent to the activity of men and djinn'" (Gramlich, "Madjdhub, 5:129).

25. Carl W. Ernst, *Words of Ecstasy in Sufism*, is an admirable attempt in this direction that approaches the subject through the prism of *shatḥiyāt* (ecstatic expressions).

26. The origin and meaning of the word *qalandar* remains undetermined to this day. The most often cited, and indeed so far the only plausible, suggested derivation is that of the lexicographers Muḥammad Ḥusayn ibn Khalaf al-Tabrizī and 'Abd al-Rashīd al-Tattavī, who consider the word to be a variation of the Persian *kalandar*, "coarse stick; uncouth, uncultivated man." Al-Tabrizī regards the transformation of the initial *kāf* into *qāf* as an arabization (*Burhān-i qāṭī*, ed. Muḥammad Mu'in, 3:1540 and 1680); al-Tattavī attributes it to the "passage of time and change of tongue" (*Farhang-i Rashīdī*, ed. Zūlfikār 'Alī and 'Azīz al-Rahmān, 2:164). Cf. Murtaẓā Šarrāf, "Ayīn-i qalandarī," *Armaghān* 52—dawrah-i sī-yu nuhum—(1349sh/1970): 705-15 and 53—dawrah-i chihilum (1350sh/1971): 15-21. In Arabic, the word *qalandar*, also found in the metathesized form *qarandal* in the seventh/thirteenth and eighth/fourteenth century sources, never seems to have meant more than "mendicant dervish," which would speak against the possibility of an Arabic origin, and an Arabic etymology is in itself quite unlikely for linguistic reasons; see Mu'in's note in al-Tabrizī, *Burhān-i qāṭī*, 3:1540; Meier, 500-501, nn. 183-87; and Yazıcı, "Kalandar," 472-73. The possibility of an Indian origin cannot be altogether ruled out, however, even if a plausible Indian etymology is yet to be put forward. For a Sanskrit etymology that is not altogether intelligible to me, see Sadeddin Kocatürk, "Dar bārah-i firqah-i qalandariyah va qalandar'nāmah-i Khaṭīb-i Fārisī, ma'nā-yi kalimah-i qalandar," *Doğu Dilleri* (Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Doğu Dil ve Edebiyatları Araştırmaları Enstitüsü) 2 (1971): 89. The word survives in present-day Turkish as *kalender* and in Persian and Urdu as *qalandar*, or more often as *qalandarānah*, referring to carefree, simple, bohemian, or unconventional persons or behavior. In northern India, the word *qalandar* usually denotes a beggar or more frequently a monkey or bear player; see Digby, 65; Aziz Ahmad, *An Intellectual History of Islam in India*, 45; and Annemarie Schim-

mel, *Islam in the Indian Subcontinent*, 34-35, n. 71 (relying on Digby). In Pakistan, the word *qalandar* is largely interchangeable with *malang*, another term used to refer to antinomian dervishes (I owe this information to Jamal Elias).

27. For a general overview, see J. T. P. De Bruijn, "The *Qalandariyyāt* in Persian Mystical Poetry, from Sana'i Onwards," in *The Legacy of Mediaeval Persian Sufism*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn, 75-86.

28. "I am that wanderer whose name is Qalandar; / I have neither home nor goods nor kitchen. / When day comes I wander round the world; / when night falls I lay my head on a brick" (Bābā Tāhir 'Uryān Hamadānī, *Dīwān-i Bābā Tāhir 'Uryān Hamadānī*, ed. Manūchihr Ādamīyat, 8). Cf. Muṣṭabā Mīnuvī, "Az khāzā'in-i Turkīyah," *Majallah-i Dānishkadāh-i Adabiyāt* (Tehran) 4 (1335sh/1956): 57. The English translation is by Digby, 61.

29. Abū Sa'īd-i Abū al-Khayr, *Sukhanān-i manzūm-i Abū Sa'īd-i Abū al-Khayr*, ed. Sa'īd Nafīsī, 41 and 58, nos. 281 and 397, respectively.

30. 'Abd Allāh Ansārī Haravī, *Risālah-i Qalandar'nāmah*, in *Rasā'il-i jāmi'-i 'arīf-i qarn-i chahārum-i hijrī Khwājah 'Abd Allāh Ansārī*, ed. Vahīd Dastgirdī, 92-99. Cf. Meier, 495; and De Bruijn, "*Qalandariyyāt*," 78, on the question of authorship. Also cf. characterization of the *Qalandar'nāmah* in Yazıcı, "*Qalandariyya*," 4:473: "a system of thought advocating inner contentment, the unimportance of learning, the avoidance of all display and contempt for the transient world and everything in it."

31. For a list and analysis of *Qalandariyyāt*, see Helmut Ritter, "Philologika XV: Farīduddīn 'Aṭṭār III. 7. Der Dīwān," *Oriens* 12 (1959): 1-88; Ritter, index, s.v. "*Qalandariyyāt*"; also De Bruijn, "*Qalandariyyāt*"; and Johann Christoph Bürgel, "The Pious Rogue: A Study in the Meaning of *Qalandar* and *Rend* in the Poetry of Muhammad Iqbal," *Edebiyat* 4 (1979): 43-49.

32. On Amīr Husaynī, see Zabīh Allāh Šafā, *Tārīkh-i Adabiyāt dar Īrān*, 3, ii:751-63 (with ample references); and N. Māyil Haravī, *Sharḥ-i ḥāl va āṣār-i Amīr Husaynī Ghūrī Haravī, mutavaffā* 718. For the text of the *Qalandar'nāmah*, see Sadeddin Kocatürk, "Iran'da İslamiyetten sonraki yüzyıllarda fikir akımlarına toplu bir bakış ve 'kalenderiye tarikatı' ile ilgili bir risale," *Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi Dergisi* 28 (1970): 227-29. Both Meier and Haravī rely on fourteen verses only, as these appear in Rizā Qulī Khān Hidāyat, *Majma' al-fūṣṣahā*, 2:15. All of these fourteen couplets are to be found in the full text. Kocatürk relies on mss. in London and Tehran and reports the existence of two further copies in Ayasofya (now in Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi), Istanbul, without citing their call numbers, which are given as 1914 and 2032 by Gölpınarlı in several of his works (for instance, *100 Soruda Türkiye'de Mezhepler ve Tarikatlar*, 259). A fifth copy in Paris is reported by Aḥmad Munzavī, *Fihrist-i nuskhahā-yi khattī-i Fārsī*, 4:3049, no. 32937. It could be added here that the "Shihāb-i Millah va Dīn" whom Amīr Husaynī mentions in verse 54 was most likely Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar al-Suhrawardī, to whom Husaynī was connected through his own master Bahā' al-Dīn Zakariyā' Multānī. Since Amīr Husaynī's composition is the only independent long poem on the *Qalandar*-topos, it is useful to summarize the major themes here: indifference to both this world and the hereafter; acceptance of one's sins, and denunciation of one's acts of devotion; wandering; *Qalandars* as the repository of the secret of the creation and adorned with God's grace, the "cream" of creation; mirth and merrymaking, dance and ecstasy, wine-drinking, looking at beardless boys; freedom from hypocrisy, fraud, deception; dependence on love to the point of disregarding reason; the

only way to God being that of the Qalandars. It is worth noting here that the Ottoman Vāhidi had access to Ḥusaynī's work and incorporated many of his verses in approximate Turkish translation into his *Menākeb*, though his debt to Ḥusaynī did not extend to a total reliance upon his text (Vāhidi, 54, n. 40).

33. Professor J. T. P. De Bruijn is currently preparing an extensive study of the *Qalandariyāt* in early Persian poetry (oral correspondence, May 1992).

34. Digby, 62 (n. 4) writes: "The growth and diffusion of groups of wandering Qalandars is attested by an anecdote in 'Aṭṭār's celebrated poem, the *Manṭiq al-ṭayr*, which was composed not later than 573/1177. An Arab, coming to 'Ajam (Iran and adjacent Persian-speaking areas), was amazed by the unfamiliar customs of the land. On his road he fell in with a band of shaven Qalandars, a people he had never seen before. He joined them, shaved his hair, and participated in various obscurely described but probably orgiastic experiences with them; but was maltreated, assaulted and robbed by them before he returned to his own land. The anecdote appears to indicate that groups of wandering Qalandars were a spectacle in Khurasan in the third quarter of the twelfth century; but had not then reached the Arab Middle East. They were also by that time characterized by wild and antinomian behavior similar to that found in the thirteenth-century anecdotes discussed in this paper, and had adopted the practice of shaving their eyebrows and facial hair."

In the text of Farid al-Dīn Muḥammad 'Aṭṭār Nishābūrī's *Manṭiq al-ṭayr* (ed. Sayyid Ṣādiq Gawharīn, 191-92), however, there is no sign that the Qalandars had shaved their heads, eyebrows, or facial hair or that the Arab for his part shaved his own hair when he joined them (the expression *'ūr-sar*, "bareheaded," in line 3437 seems rather to refer to lack of headgear). The claim that the Arab "participated in . . . probably orgiastic experiences" with the Qalandars is equally baseless. The only possible evidence for this interpretation is the expression *gum shud mardiyash*, "he lost his manhood," in line 3435, which does, however, have other more innocuous connotations (for instance, loss of honor). The Qalandars did not maltreat, assault, and rob the Arab; instead, he lost money to one of them in straightforward gambling: *burd az-ū dar yak nadab*, "[the Qalandar] won from him in one bet." In support of the interpretation adopted here, see Ritter, 381, where the passage in question is summarized in German.

35. Suhrawardī, 66; German translation, 85 (9:23); an earlier German translation of the passage is supplied by Ritter, "Philologika XV," 14-16. English translations are found in various secondary studies (for instance, Trimmingham, 267).

36. Aḥmad ibn 'Alī al-Maqrīzī, *al-Mawā'iz wa-al-i'tibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-al-āthār*, 4:301; 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad Jāmī, *Nafahāt al-uns min ḥazarāt al-quds*, ed. Maḥdī Tawḥīdī Pūr, 14-15. For other sources that quote from 'Awārif al-ma'ārif, see Köprülü 1, 298, n. 3.

37. For the date of 'Awārif al-ma'ārif's composition, see Gramlich's introduction to his German translation of the work, 14-15. It is, of course, possible that the name Qalandar was not yet attached to members of Jamāl al-Dīn's circle at this early stage.

38. Meier, 512, thinks that al-Suhrawardī must have been describing an earlier stage of the Qalandari movement.

39. Paul Rychaut, *The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire*, 260.

4. ASCETIC VIRTUOSI

1. Fārisī. In citing this work in the following discussion, page and line references refer to Yazıcı's and verse numbers to Zarrīnkūb's editions, respectively; thus 6.5/82 is page 6, line 5, in Yazıcı's text and verse 82 in Zarrīnkūb's. The title of the work is not given in the text. The author's pen-name, Khaṭīb Fārisī, appears on 6.5/82, 55.14/1068, 89.1/1746, and 90.3/1768. He gives the name of his *pīr* on 5.2/58. That he was born in 697/1297-98 can be deduced from his statement at the end of the work that he was fifty-one years of age when he completed his composition, 90.3/1768.

2. Khaṭīb Fārisī gives Jamāl al-Dīn's dates as 382/992-93 to 463/1070-71. As Bāyazīd is known to have died in the 260s/870s at the latest, more than a century before the alleged birth date of Jamāl al-Dīn, Fārisī clearly did not have a knack for historical accuracy. On Bāyazīd, see Helmut Ritter, "Abū Yazīd al-Biṣṭāmī," in *EI*, 1:162-63; and Gerhard Bowering, "Beṣṭāmī, Bāyazīd," in *EIR*, 4:183-86.

3. Fārisī, 18.4/319-25.21/468; the parallels in the *Mirṣād* are documented by Zarrīnkūb in his notes to the text on 121-25. Naturally, it is impossible to reconstruct the origins of this use of common materials by Najm al-Dīn Rāzī and Khaṭīb Fārisī, though it is likely that the latter (or Jamāl al-Dīn himself) simply borrowed from the former.

4. See chapter 2, no. 21, for references on this *ḥadīth*.

5. All of the practices mentioned receive extended treatment in Jamāl al-Dīn's sacred biography. On dwelling in cemeteries, see especially 82-84/1609-1668, the section entitled *dalīl guṣṭan-i Sayyid dar bāb-i ānkih dar gūristān nishastan[rā] martaba chīst* (in both Damascus and Damietta Jamāl al-Dīn resides only in cemeteries); on nakedness, 31.5-7/567-69, 32.10-14/593-97, 42.6/796; on silence, 33.2/607, 41.9/778, 42.6/796, 46.3/875, 80.2-3/1565-66, 80.16/1579, and 84 (whole page)/1646-63; on abstinence from food, 33.5-6/610-11 (eating weeds about once a week), 36.7-15/672-80 (rejection of "cooked"/other people's food), 37.20, 41.9/778, 42.5/795, 47.20-21/910-11; on keeping vigils, 41.9/778, 42.6/796; on the significance of hair, 32.5/588, especially the section called *dar ḥikmat va maw'izah va taḥsīn*: 46.7/879 to 47.16/907.

6. Abū Bakr Iṣfahānī's miraculous deeds in Damascus are narrated on 47.18/908-53.15/1026.

7. The beard-producing miracle is also recorded as follows in Baṭṭūṭah, 1:61-63. Some time after Jamāl al-Dīn comes to Damietta and settles in its cemetery, he has a brief encounter with the magistrate (*qāḍī*) of the town, a certain Ibn al-ʿAmīd, who loses no time in reproving Jamāl al-Dīn for his innovation of shaving the beard. For his part, Jamāl al-Dīn declares the magistrate to be an ignoramus since, riding a mule in the cemetery, Ibn al-ʿAmīd is apparently unaware that the dead deserve as much respect as the living. When Ibn al-ʿAmīd retorts that shaving the beard is a graver offense, Jamāl al-Dīn answers, "Is this what you mean?" and, letting out a loud cry, produces a mighty black beard. At a second cry, this beard turns white and at a third disappears completely. After this miracle, Ibn al-ʿAmīd becomes a faithful follower of Jamāl al-Dīn and has a hospice (*zāwiyah*) built in his name, where Jamāl al-Dīn is buried upon his death.

8. The introductory section "On the Merits of Poverty" (*dar ṣifat-i faṣīlat-i faqr*) is on 6.7/85-8.11/126. For the emphasis on Muḥammad's choice of poverty,

see 3.2-4/17-19 and 6.12-7.11/89-105; on Jamāl al-Dīn as the king of poverty, see 10.18/172 and 11.13-15/190-92.

9. Qalandar, 130-32 (*majlis* 37). This work, which records the "oral discourses" (*maṣfūẓāt*) of the Chishtī master Naṣīr al-Dīn Chirāgh-i Dihlī (d. 757/1356), was composed after 754/1353; see Digby, 96, nn. 11 and 112. The anecdote that contains the epithet "walking library" may have been a stock item in Chishtī lore, since it also appears, with no mention of Jamāl al-Dīn's name, in a shorter version in the conversations of Naṣīr al-Dīn's master, Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā' (d. 725/1325); see Amīr Ḥasan Sijzī, *Favā'id al-fu'ād*, 3; English translation: *Nizam ad-Din Awliya: Morals for the Heart*, trans. Bruce B. Lawrence, 84.

10. For the story of Ḥamīd Qalandar's conversion to the path of Qalandars as a child as well as his own testimony of the value that he placed on his Qalandar allegiance, see Qalandar, 6; also Digby, 71-72. A recent discussion of the place of the *Khayr al-majālīs* in Chishtī *maṣfūẓāt* literature appears in Carl W. Ernst, *Eternal Garden: Mysticism, History, and Politics at a South Asian Sufi Center*, 68-71, where the question of Ḥamīd's scholarship is also addressed.

11. Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Jazarī recorded in his history that he saw several fascicles of a Qur'ānic *tafsīr* in Jamāl al-Dīn's own handwriting; see Dhahabī, 398 (al-Dhahabī died in 748/1348 or 752/1352-53); relying on al-Dhahabī, Ṣafadī, 293 (al-Ṣafadī died in 764/1363); Nu'aymī, 2:210-12 (al-Nu'aymī died in 927/1520-21). For Shams al-Dīn, Muḥammad al-Jazarī, see Carl Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, Suppl. 2:33 and 45; cf. A. S. Bazmee Ansari, "Al-Djazari," in *EL*, 2:522-23.

12. Dhahabī, 397; Ṣafadī, 292; Khaṭīb (written in 683/1284-85), 51b.

13. Khaṭīb, 51b.

14. The quotation is from Shams al-Dīn Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn 'Uthmān al-Dimashqī al-Dhahabī, *al-Ibar fī khabar man ghabar*, ed. Abū Ḥājir Muḥammad al-Sa'īd ibn Bisṣūnī Zaghlūl, 3:357. See also Ibn al-Kathīr, 'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'il ibn 'Umar (ca. 700-774/1300-1373), *al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah*, 13:307; Nu'aymī, 2:197; and Ibn al-'Imād, 'Abd al-Ḥayy ibn Aḥmad, *Shadharāt al-dhahab fī akhbār man dhahab* (up to 1080/1670), 5:389.

15. Khaṭīb reports the young ascetic's name as Garūbad. Qalandar, 131, alone among the sources, attributes Jamāl al-Dīn's conversion to an encounter he had with a group known as "iron-wearers." Though rather weak, this piece of evidence serves to direct attention to the fact that iron-wearing Ḥaydarīs could indeed have exercised influence on Jamāl al-Dīn's turn to asceticism.

16. Fārisī, 30-34/546-629. Dhahabī, 397; Ṣafadī, 292; and Nu'aymī, 2:210-12 also mention an 'Uthmān Kūhī al-Fārisī along with Jalāl Darguzīnī in this story.

17. Baṭṭūṭah, 1:61-63; Ebū'l-Ḥayr Rūmī, *Ṣaltuknāme*, ed. Fahir İz, 363b-69a; Muḥammad Qāsim Hindū'Shāh Astarābādī, known as Firishtah, *Gulshan-i Ibrāhīmī*, usually called *Tārīkh-i Firishtah*, 2:407-8; Qāsim Ghānī, *Bahār dar āsār va asfār va ahvāl-i Ḥāfiẓ*, 2:442-43.

18. Significantly, this anecdote is not mentioned in Jamāl al-Dīn's sacred biography, *Manāqib*, written by one of his later followers. The fact that the sources do not agree on the timing and place of the anecdote is further reason to suspect its authenticity. Moreover, the same motif is found in other hagiographical material: essentially the same story, without the episode of shaving and with a different ending, is reported about a certain Shaqrān ibn 'Ubayd Allāh in one early seventh/thirteenth-century Arabic source and two early ninth/fifteenth-century ones; see Christopher Schurman Taylor, "The Cult of the Saints in Late Medieval Egypt," 158-59.

19. The presence of a hospice of Qalandars in Damietta is reported in Baṭṭūṭah, 1:61. Apart from the sources mentioned in the above discussion, there are some other, more oblique, references to Jamāl al-Dīn in the sources. If a brief note in Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Qazvinī, *The Tārīkh-i Guzīdah* (730/1329–30), ed. Edward G. Browne, 1:790, indeed refers to Jamāl al-Dīn Sāwī and not to some other shaykh called Jamāl al-Dīn, then the date of his death was 4 Shawwāl 651/27 November 1253. In addition, in his *Zahr al-ʿarīsh fī aḥkām (or tahrīm) al-hashish*, Muḥammad ibn Bahādur al-Zarkashī (d. 794/1392) mentions Aḥmad [sic] al-Sāwajī al-Qalandarī, along with Shaykh Ḥaydar, as the “discoverer” of hashish; see chapter 2, n. 16.

20. On the town Zāvah, see Dihkhudā, s.v. “Zāvah.”

21. Only Muʿīn al-Dīn Muḥammad Zamajī Isfīzārī, *Rawzāt al-jannāt fī awṣāf madīnah Ḥarāt* (written 897/1491–92), ed. S. M. Kāzīm Imām, 229, writes that Ḥaydar traveled from country to country; other sources are silent on this issue.

22. Ludwig Adamec, ed., *Historical Gazetteer of Iran*, vol. 2, *Meshed and Northeastern Iran*, 653–55.

23. The following sources cite 617 or 618/1220–22 as Quṭb al-Dīn’s death date and also report that he was a centenarian at his death: al-ʿUqbārī (possibly d. 690/1291), *Kitāb al-sawānīh*, in Rosenthal, 51–53; Qazwīnī, 382–83; Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, *Tārīkh-i Guzīdah*, 792–93; idem, *The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat-al-Qulūb Composed by Ḥamd-Allāh Mustawfī of Qazwīn in 740 (1340)*, ed. Guy Le Strange, 151–54; Giyās al-Dīn ibn Humām al-Dīn Khvāndamīr, *Tārīkh-i ḥabīb al-siyar fī akhbār al-bashar*, ed. by Jalāl al-Dīn Humāʾī, 3:332; Karbalāʾī 1:444. Dawlat’Shāh ibn ‘Alā’ al-Dawlah Bakhtī’Shāh al-Ghāzī al-Samarqandī, *Tadhkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*, ed. Edward G. Browne, 192, however, claims that Quṭb al-Dīn died in 597/1200–1201 or 602/1205–6, while Faṣīḥ al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad, known as Faṣīḥ al-Khvāfi, *Mujmal-i Faṣīḥī* (up to 845/1441–42), ed. Maḥmūd Farrukh, 2:288, has him die in 613/1216–17. Zāvah was burned down, and its inhabitants massacred by the Mongols in 617/1220; see ‘Alā’ al-Dīn ‘Atā Malik Juvaynī, *The History of the World-Conqueror [Tārīkh-i Jahān’gushā]*, trans. John Andrew Boyle, 1:144.

24. Faṣīḥ al-Khvāfi, *Mujmal-i Faṣīḥī*, 2:288, cites Quṭb al-Dīn’s full name as Quṭb al-Dīn ibn Tīmūr ibn Abū Bakr ibn Sultān’Shāh ibn Sultān Khān al-Sālūri. Dawlat’Shāh, *Tadhkirat al-shuʿarāʾ*, 192, claims that Ḥaydar was a descendant of the sultans of Turkistan through his father, Shāhvar. In his extended translation into Chagatay of Jāmī’s *Nafahāt al-uns*, ‘Alī Šīr Nevāʾī also reports that Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar was the son of a sultan of Turkistan; see *Nesāyīmū’l-maḥabbe min ṣemāyimi’l-fütüvve* (comp. 901/1495–96), ed. Kemal Eraslan, 383–84. Karbalāʾī, 1:444, repeats the report about Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar’s Turkish descent. Isfīzārī, *Rawzāt al-jannāt*, 216, notes that he saw the genealogy of Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar recorded in the *Nasabnāmah* of Qāzī Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad-i Zūzan; this work, however, is not extant; see the editor’s note in the *Rawzāt al-jannāt*, 217, n. 4. The possibility that Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar had special appeal among Turks is raised by the testimony of the famous cosmographer and geographer Zakarīyā’ al-Qazwīnī who saw (roughly half a century after Quṭb al-Dīn’s death, presumably in Zāvah) Turkish slaves of extreme beauty, barefooted and dressed in felt; he was told that these were Ḥaydar’s followers (Qazwīnī, 382–83).

25. Later sources on Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar derive their information from the earlier ones cited above without in any way adding to them; see, for instance, Aḥmad Amīn Rāzī, *Ḥaḡī iqlīm*, ed. Javād Fāzil, 2:188; Zayn al-ʿAbidīn Shīrvānī,

Būstān al-siyāhah, ed. Sayyid 'Abd Allāh Mustawfī, 219; and Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh ibn Rahmat 'Alī Nī'mat Allāhī al-Shīrāzī, *Ṭarā'iq al-ḥaqā'iq*, ed. Muḥammad Ja'far Mahjūb, 2:642. Still other sources confuse Qutb al-Dīn Ḥaydar with a certain Sultān Mīr Ḥaydar Tūnī, also known as Qutb al-Dīn, who lived in Tabriz and died there in 830/1426-27; see, for instance, Nūr Allāh ibn Sayyid Sharīf Ḥusaynī Mar'ashī Shushtarī, *Majālis al-mu'minīn*, 36 and 267; and Dihkhudā, s.v. "Qutb al-Dīn Tūnī" and "Ḥaydar, Qutb al-Dīn." Other sources that confuse the two Qutb al-Dīns are noted in Ḥusayn Mīr Ja'farī, "Ḥaydarī va Nī'matī," *Āyandah* 9 (1362sh/1983): 742-45 (earlier English version: "The Ḥaydarī-Nī'matī Conflicts in Iran," *Iranian Studies* 12 [1979]: 61-142). The most reliable account on Tūnī appears to be that of Karbalā'ī, 1:467-68. The *Divān-i Qutb al-Dīn Ḥaydar* reported in Ibn Yūsuf Shīrāzī, *Fihrist-i Kitābkhānah-i Madrasah-i 'Alī-i Sipahsālār*, entry 564, to be in the Library of Madrasah-i Sipahsālār would appear to belong to Qutb al-Dīn Ḥaydar Tūnī; see Sa'īd Nafīsī, *Justujū dar ahvāl va āsār-i Farīd al-Dīn 'Aṭṭār Nishābūrī*, mīm/dāl-mīm/ha, where, however, Nafīsī confuses the two Qutb al-Dīns.

26. Qalandar, 174-76, makes Qutb al-Dīn Ḥaydar a disciple of Shaykh Luqmān, while Nevā'ī, *Nesāyimū-l-mahabbe*, 383-84; Karbalā'ī, 1:597; and *Vilāyet-nāme: Manāqib-i Ḥacī Bektā's-i Velī*, ed. Abdūlbakī Gölpinarlı, 9-11, portray him as a follower of Ahmed Yesevī. For references on Shaykh Luqmān, see Meier, 411-12. A concise account on Yesevī is Mehmed Fuad Köprülü, "Ahmed Yesevī," in *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 1:210-15. This article contains improvements over Köprülü's earlier study on Yesevī, *Türk Edebiyatında İlk Mutasavvıflar*. The view that Qutb al-Dīn Ḥaydar was a disciple of Jamāl al-Dīn Sāvī (see, for instance, Tringham, 39; and Digby, 82) is unfounded and should be rejected.

27. Khvāndamīr, *Tārīkh-i ḥabīb al-siyar*, 2:332. The *rubā'ī* in question reads as follows: "rindī dīdam nishastah bar khushk-i zamīn / nah kufr u nah islām u nah dunyā u nah dīn / nah ḥaqq nah ḥaqīqat nah ṭarīqat nah yaqīn / andar dū jahān ki rā buvad zahrah-i īn." This same *rubā'ī*, with few changes, is attributed to Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606/1209) in Karbalā'ī, 1:444; he is said to have composed it for Bābā Faraj (on whom see Dihkhudā, s.v. "Bābā Faraj"). On the same page, al-Qurrā'ī notes that the quatrain also appears in some collections attributed to Khayyām (d. 526/1131); see, for instance, 'Umar ibn Ibrāhīm Nishābūrī, known as Khayyām, *Tarānahā-yi Khayyām*, ed. Šadiq Hidāyat, 102, no. 104. In this connection, it is worth noting that Shāh-i Sanjān was sufficiently close to Qutb al-Dīn Ḥaydar both in time and in space to make the attribution of the above quatrain to him a real possibility. On Shāh-i Sanjān, see Dihkhudā, s.v., "Shāh-i Sanjān," and the list of references cited therein. To this list one should add Qalandar, 174-76, where, significantly, it is reported that both Ḥaydar-i Zāvah and Shāh-i Sanjān were among the followers of Shaykh Luqmān.

28. Dawlat'Shāh, *Tadhkirat al-shu'arā*, 192. It is not known if 'Aṭṭār really composed a *Ḥaydarnāmah* at all. Ritter, 139, writes, "Dass 'Aṭṭār ein *Ḥaidarnāma* verfasst hat, steht durch sein selbsterzeugnis im *Lisān al-ghayb* fest," yet in his later article "Aṭṭār," in *EI*, 1:754, he includes *Lisān al-ghayb* among a group of apocryphal works that came to be attributed to 'Aṭṭār but were certainly not composed by him. Benedikt Reinert, "'Aṭṭār, Farīd-al-Dīn," in *EIR*, 3:25, agrees with this last judgment without touching on the *Ḥaydarnāmah*. Nafīsī, *Justujū*, 97 and 110, n. 16, merely notes that the earliest source to attribute a *Ḥaydarnāmah* to 'Aṭṭār is Dawlat'Shāh's *Tadhkirat al-shu'arā*, that Kātib Çelebi also mentions a *Ḥaydarnāmah* (see Muṣṭafā ibn 'Abdullāh, known as Kātib Çelebi, *Kashf al-*

zunūn, ed. Şerefettin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge, 1:694, where the name of the author is not given), and that no such *Haydarnāmah* has come to light. Badī' al-Zamān Furūzānfar, *Sharḥ-i aḥvāl va taḥlīl-i āṣār-i Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn Muḥammad 'Attār Nishābūrī*, 31 and 76, notes that Dawlat'Shāh's entry on 'Attār is not trustworthy on the whole and rules out the possibility that 'Attār could have written a *Haydarnāmah*. Šafā, *Tārīkh-i Adabīyāt dar Irān*, 1:861-62, who relies only on Nafīsī, has nothing new to say on the topic. Cf. Munzavī, *Fihrist-i nuskhahā-yi khatī-i Fārsī*, 4:2777, no. 29315.

29. Qalandar, 176.

30. Al-'Uqbārī, *Kitāb al-sawānīh*, as reported in Rosenthal, 51-53. It is here recorded, on the authority of a certain Shaykh Ja'far ibn Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī whom al-'Uqbārī met in Tustar in 658/1260, that the use of hashish as an intoxicant was first "discovered" by Shaykh Haydar while he led the life of a recluse in a small *zāwīyah* situated on a mountain between Nishāpūr and Zāvah in Khorasan. This account of the discovery of hashish is repeated in summary in the *Zahr al-'arīsh fī aḥkām (or taḥrīm) al-hashīsh* of Muḥammad ibn Bahādūr al-Zarkashī, 170, with the additional information that the discovery took place around the year 550/1155-56.

31. Qazwīnī, 382.

32. Sijzī, *Fawā'id al-fī'ād*, 12; English version: *Morals for the Heart*, 101-2, also 360. The Persian edition reads "Haydar'zādah" instead of "Haydar-i Zāvah." The same reading appears in the editions of Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī, *Tārīkh-i Guzīdah*; and Khvāndamīr, *Tārīkh-i ḥabīb al-siyar*, 3:332, while the editor of Qalandar, 176, opts for the reading "Haydar-i Zāwīyah." All these are here corrected to "Haydar-i Zāvah." Cf. Digby, 105, n. 76.

33. *Vilāyetnāme-i Otman Baba* survives in two manuscripts: (1) Abdāl; (2) Ms. Adnan Ötügen İl Halk Kütüphanesi (Ankara), no. 495 (dated 1316/1899, copyist Hasan Tebrīzī). For a summary of its contents, see Hüseyin Fehmi, "Otman Baba ve Vilāyetnāmesi," *Türk Yurdu* 5 (1927): 239-44 (Fehmi uses ms. 1, which he incorrectly dates to 1073/1663); and Ahmet Yaşar Ocak, *Bektāşī Menākıbnāmelerinde İslam Öncesi İnanç Motifleri*, 16-17 (Ocak uses ms. 2). A selection from the work (ms. 1, fols. 10b-15a) appears in Fahir İz, *Eski Türk Edebiyatında Nesir: XIV. Yüzyıldan XIX. Yüzyıl Ortasına Kadar Yazmalardan Seçilmiş Metinler*, 330-36. The date of composition appears in Abdāl, fol. 129a.

34. Otman Baba's name is discussed in Abdāl on fol. 21b and his arrival and early activities in Anatolia on fols. 9b-11b; the dates of his birth and death are recorded on fols. 122b-123b. The date of his death also appears in Yemīnī, 83. Also see Ocak, 99-102 (relying on ms. 1).

35. On Sufi views of the relationship between sainthood and prophecy, see Hermann Landolt, "Walāyah," in *The Encyclopedia of Religion*, 15:316-23, esp. 321-22; and Bernd Radtke, "The Concept of Wilāya in Early Sufism," in *Classical Persian Sufism: From Its Origins to Rumi*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn, 483-96; also Chodkiewicz, *Le sceau des saints*.

36. Abdāl, fols. 5b-6b.

37. Ibid., fol. 32b. The relevant portion of Qur'ān 7:172, adopted with slight changes from Abdullah Yusuf Ali's translation, *The Meaning of the Glorious Qur'ān* (London: Nadim and Co., 1975), 227-28, reads: "When your Lord drew forth from the children of Adam, from their loins, their descendants, and made them testify concerning themselves (saying): 'Am I not your Lord?' they said: 'Yes, we testify.'" Creative interpretation of this verse was a feature of Sufi

thought from its earliest phases; see Gerhard Böwering, *The Mystical Vision of Existence in Classical Islam: The Qur'ānic Hermeneutics of the Ṣūfī Sahl Al-Tustarī* (d. 283/896), 153-57.

38. Abdāl, fols. 8a and 50b.

39. Ibid., fol. 6b. On this *ḥadīth qudsī*, *awliyā'ī taḥta qibābī (qābā'ī) lā ya'rīfuhum ghayrī*, see Furūzānfar, *Aḥādīth-i Maṣnavī*, 52, no. 131; and Nūr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Rahmān Isfarāyīnī, *Kāshif al-asrār*, ed. Hermann Landolt, 104, n. 144.

40. Abdāl, fols. 6b, 23a-b (on the "people of hospices"), 20a, 21b, 54b, 57b (on rejection of gifts).

41. For references on Sultān Ṣūcā' and Ḥācī Bektāš, see chapter 5, n. 62, and chapter 6, n. 71, respectively.

42. Ḥācī Bektāš and Sultān Ṣūcā' are mentioned in Abdāl, fol. 7b. On Bāyezīd Baba and Mū'min Dervīš, see fol. 28b ff; on Maḥmūd Çelebi, fols. 112b-113a.

43. Ibid., fols. 11b and 32b.

44. Ibid., fols. 10b and 19b-21b.

5. DERVISH GROUPS IN FULL BLOOM, 1200-1500

1. Dhahabī, 398; idem, *al-Ibar fī khabar man ghabar*, ed. Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Munajjid, 5:141-42; Ṣafadī, 293.

2. Ibn al-Kathīr, *al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah*, 13:196; Nu'aymī, 2:212. *Vilāyet-nāme*, 9-11, also refers to a period of captivity in Quṭb al-Dīn Ḥaydar's life. According to this work, Quṭb al-Dīn was held a prisoner by the "unbelievers of Badakhshān" (in present-day northeast Afghanistan), presumably the Ismā'īlīs, and was saved from captivity by Ḥācī Bektāš.

3. Ibn al-Fūṭī 'Abd al-Razzāq ibn Aḥmad, *al-Hawādith al-jāmi'ah* (Baghdad, 1351/1932), 342, as quoted in Michel M. Mazzaoui, *The Origins of the Safawids: Sīfism, Ṣūfism and the Gulāt*, 43, n. 3; also Meier, 500. A somewhat different version of the same story is found in 'Ubayd-i Zākānī, *Hajvīyāt va hazlīyāt*, 39; see also Edward Granville Browne, *A Literary History of Persia*, 3:251; and George Morrison, Julian Baldick, and Shafī'ī Kadkanī, *History of Persian Literature from the Beginning of the Islamic Period to the Present Day*, 66.

4. On al-Ḥarīrī, see note 17 below.

5. Ibn al-Kathīr, *al-Bidāyah*, 1:344; al-Maqrīzī, *al-Mawā'iz*, 4:301-2.

6. Nu'aymī, 2:209-10. On Qalandars and Ḥaydarīs in Damascus, see also Pouzet, 228-29.

7. Baṭṭūṭah, 1:61. Takrūr was the name given in particular to present-day Mauritania and Mali, though it was also used more generally to denote the Saharan region stretching from the Nile to the Atlantic; see Chouki El Hamel, "Fath ash-Shakūr: Hommes de lettres, disciples et enseignement dans le Takrūr du XVI^e au début du XIX^e siècle," 74-75.

8. Al-Maqrīzī, *al-Mawā'iz*, 4:301-2.

9. Mujir al-Dīn al-'Ulaymī al-Hanbalī, *al-Uns al-jalīl bi-ta'rikh al-quds wa-al-khalīl*, 2:413-14. See also Huda Lutfi, *Al-Quds al-Mamlūkiyya: A History of Mamlūk Jerusalem Based on the Haram Documents*, 115 (Zāwiyat al-Shaykh Ibrāhīm).

10. Jawbarī, fol. 18a, lines 4-6. On al-Jawbarī, see Brockelmann, *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*, 1:655 (497) and Suppl. 1:910. A description of the contents of the work appears in Clifford Edmund Bosworth, *The Mediaeval Islamic Underworld: The Banū Sāsān in Arabic Society and Literature*, 1:106-18. I

me of
Badī'
ammad
is not
d have
relies
christ-i

is here
Shīrāzī
as an
fe of a
Zāvah
nary in
dur al-
k place

-2, also
Zāvah."
Tārikh-i
litor of
re here

(2) Ms.
copyist
'Otman
ms. 1,
Bektāši
s. 2). A
ski Türk
lan Seçil-
12.

rival and
leath are
nīnī, 83.

recy, see
-23, esp.
ism," in
483-96;

ith slight
Glorious
ord drew
and made
hey said:
e of Sufi

follow Brockelmann in giving al-Jawbarī's personal name as 'Abd al-Rahmān; the Süleymaniye manuscript records it as 'Abd al-Rahīm.

11. Jawbarī, fol. 17a. This manuscript copy reads "Rifā'iyah" instead of "Haydariyah" (followed by Bosworth, *The Mediaeval Islamic Underworld*, 113), yet the French translation of *Kashf al-asrār*, based on more copies, gives the name "Haydariyah": *Le voile arraché: L'autre visage de l'Islam*, trans. René R. Khawam, 83.

12. Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Taymīyah, *Majmū'at al-rasā'il wa-al-masā'il*, 1:33 and 64-65. Cf. Muhammad Umar Memon, *Ibn Taymīyah's Struggle against Popular Religion, with an Annotated Translation of His Kitāb iqtidā' aṣ-ṣirāṭ al-mustaqīm mukhālafat aṣḥāb al-jahīm*, 61-62 and 65-66.

13. Muḥammad ibn Shākir al-Kutubī, *Fawāt al-wafayāt*, vol. 3, ed. Iḥsān 'Abbās, 36-37; and Meier, 505-6, where the poem is given in German translation.

14. I read *julnak/jalnak/jilnak*, not *jilink* (Persian *jiling*, "a kind of silken stuff") as Meier does, and take this word to be an arabization of the Turkish *gönlek*, "shirt." The reading *jilink* does not make much sense in this context. The text reads: "nabīsu 'iwaḍa hādhā al-kattān julnak min šūf al-khīrfān aw dalaq aw nuṣbiḥu 'uryān."

15. Vā'iz Kāshifī, *Rashahāt 'ayn al-hayāt*, 2:460-61.

16. *Kitāb alf laylah wa-laylah*, ed. Muḥsin Mahdī, 137; English translation: *The Arabian Nights*, trans. Husain Haddawy, 76 ("The Story of the Porter and the Three Ladies"). To the literary evidence documented above, one could also add Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar al-Suhrawardī's (d. 632/1234) discussion on Qalandars in his celebrated Sufi manual *'Awārif al-ma'ārif* (Suhrawardī, 66), discussed in chapter 3 above. The Qalandars survived in Egypt well into the tenth/sixteenth century; see, for instance, Michael M. Winter, *Society and Religion in Early Ottoman Egypt: Studies in the Writings of 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha'rānī*, 121, n. 52.

17. For a list of references on al-Ḥarīrī, see Meier, 507, n. 226. See also Köprülü I, 301 (continuation of n. 2 from 300); Louis Massignon, "Ḥarīriyya," in *EL*, 3:222; Pouzet, 220-21; Afākī, 2:640-41 (4/32), 2:677-78 (4/79); and Jawbarī, fols. 18a-19b. On other related dervish movements in Damascus, notably the *muwallahūn*, see Pouzet, 222-26. On Aḥmad al-Badawī, see K. Vollers and E. Littmann, "Aḥmad al-Badawī," in *EL*, 1:280-81. The most important compilation on his life is 'Abd al-Ṣamad Zayn al-Dīn, *al-Jawāhir al-sanīyah fī al-karāmāt al-aḥmadīyah*, repeatedly printed; two modern studies on him are Sa'īd 'Abd al-Fattāḥ 'Ashūr, *al-Sayyid Aḥmad al-Badawī: Shaykh wa tariqatuh*; and 'Abd al-Ḥalīm Mahmūd, *al-Sayyid Aḥmad al-Badawī*. For a study of his cult in contemporary Egypt, see Edward B. Reeves, *The Hidden Government: Ritual, Clientalism, and Legitimation in Northern Egypt*. Cf. Alfred Le Châtelier, *Les confréries musulmanes du Hedjaz*, 161-82.

18. On Aḥmad al-Rifā'ī, see D. S. Margoliouth, "Al-Rifā'ī," in *The Encyclopedia of Islam*, first edition, 6:1156-57; the standard source on his life is Taqī al-Dīn 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Wāsiṭī, *Tiryāq al-muḥibbīn fī ṭabaqāt khīrqaṭ al-mashāyikh al-'arīfīn*. That Rifā'īs wore iron collars is attested in Ibn Taymīyah, *Majmū'at al-rasā'il*, 1:131-154. On Rifā'iyah in Damascus during the seventh/thirteenth century, see Pouzet, 227; on Rifā'iyah in general, see Trimmingham, 37-40.

19. In this connection, it is possible to speculate that the initial Mongol intolerance forced the Qalandars to emigrate to other Islamic lands and generally discouraged them from entering Mongol territory. Muḥammad al-Khaṭīb, for

ahmān;

stead of
i, 113),
ves the
enē R.

il, 1:33
Popular
istaqīm

. Ihsān
trans-

silken
Turkish
ontext.
fān aw

slation:
ter and
ild also
dars in
ssed in
xteenth
n Early
52.
ee also
riyya,"
9); and
nāscus,
Vollers
portant
ah fi al-
re Sa'id
id 'Abd
cult in
Ritual,
er, Les

Encyclo-
Taḳī al-
shāyikh
nā'at al-
irteenth

Mongol
enerally
ḡib, for

instance, writes, naturally with a good deal of exaggeration occasioned by his extreme hostility toward "heretics" (*zanādiqah*): "if it were not for the might of Mongol armies, practically all regions of the world would have been filled with these bands of irreligion" (Khaṭīb, 53b). More telling is the execution of a group of Qalandars at the orders of Hülegü in Harrān in 658/1259–60; see chapter 1.

20. Fakhr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Hamadānī 'Irāqī, *Kulliyāt-i dīwān-i Shaykh Fakhr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Hamadānī mutakhallaṣ bi-'Irāqī*, ed. M. Darvish, "Muqaddimah-i jāmi'-i dīwān," 21–23.

21. Aflākī, 2:631 (4/28).

22. Rosenthal, 51.

23. Tavakkulī ibn Ismā'īl, Ibn al-Bazzāz, *Ṣafvat al-ṣafā'* (Bombay, 1329/1911), 63; and Rashīd al-Dīn Faḡl Allāh, *Geschichte der Ilkhāne Abāga bis Gaiḡatu 1265–95* (s'Gravenhage, 1957), 47 and 56, as cited in Hanna Sohrweide, "Der Sieg der Safaviden in Persien u. seine Rückwirkung auf die Schiiten Anatoliens im 16. Jh.," *Der Islam* 41 (1965): 103–4.

24. Tavakkulī ibn Ismā'īl, Ibn al-Bazzāz, *Ṣafvat al-ṣafā'*, 31, as cited in Sohrweide, "Der Sieg der Safaviden in Persien," 103; also Meier, 498, n. 165; and Jean Aubin, "Shaykh Ibrāhīm Zāhid Gilānī (1218?–1301)," *Turcica* 21–23 (1991): 41–43. Sohrweide notes that Shaykh Ṣafī too despised Qalandars, referring to *Ṣafvat al-ṣafā'*, 120, 214, and 258.

25. Khaṭīb, 52a–b. Awḡad al-Dīn Kirmānī himself was familiar with Qalandars; see Meier, 500, n. 179.

26. Abū Khālid is reported in al-'Uqbārī, *Kitāb al-sawāniḥ*, as cited in Rosenthal, 51–53; and Ḥajjī Mubārak in Aflākī, 1:215 (3/123) and 467–68 (3/437).

27. Baḡḡūṭah, 3:79–80.

28. The text of Tāj al-Dīn ibn Bahā al-Dīn Jāmī (Pūr-i Bahā)'s work entitled *Kārnāma-yi awqāf* is given in transliteration and German translation in Birgitt Hoffmann, "Von falschen Asketen und 'unfrommen' Stiftungen," in *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies Held in Turin, September 7th–11th, 1987 by the Societas Iranologica Europaea*, part 2, *Middle and New Iranian Studies*, ed. Gherardo Gnoli and Antonio Panaino, 409–85 (text on 422–83). The description of the dervish and his young companion is on 444–45 (verses 130–37). Hoffmann mistakenly thinks that the beardless boy is the dervish's son, even though Pūr-i Bahā explicitly refers to the boy as the Ḥaydarī dervish's "witness" (*shāhid*; verse 133). I thank Professor J. T. P. de Bruijn for bringing the *Kārnāma-yi awqāf* to my attention.

29. Qazwīnī, 382–83.

30. "[Bābā Resūl] had gone to Iran along with others who were exiled from Anatolia during the campaign of Temūr and had remained there. After a long period of religious education in those lands, he wanted [to join a] Sufi order, *ṭarīqat*, and became an Abdāl by spending many months and years at the *zāviyah* of Kutbeddīn Ḥaydar" (Ḥalvacıbaşızāde Maḥmūd Hulvī, *Lemezāt-i hulviye ez leme'āt-i 'ulviye*, Ms. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Halet Efendi 281 [undated], fol. 186b).

31. Karbalā'ī, 1:467–68, where, however, Tūnī is said to be a Qalandar; and Shushtarī, *Majālīs al-mu'minīn*, 36 and 267. For two differing views on the Ḥaydarīs of Tābrīz and the later Ḥaydarī-Ni'matī conflict in major cities of Iran, see Zarrīnkūb, 85–87; and Mīr Ja'farī, "Ḥaydarī va Ni'matī," 745ff.

32. Tācizāde Sa'dī Çelebi, *Münşe'āt*, ed. Necatī Lugal and Adnan Erzi, 28; Mīr Ja'farī, "Ḥaydarī va Ni'matī," 746. The person called Ni'mat Ḥaydarī, who

was responsible for bringing about the unpleasant incident that the poet Jāmī had to suffer through in Baghdad on his return trip from pilgrimage in 877–78/1472–74, also defies further identification, though in this case it is at least clear that, like the followers of Qutb al-Dīn Haydar, he had an unusually long moustache; see Vā‘iz Kāshifī, *Rashahāt ‘ayn al-hayāt* 1:257–58; and Köprülü 1, 477.

33. Meier, 509 (based on the *Mazārāt-i Kirmān* of Mihrābī, ed. Husayn Kūhī Kirmānī [Tehran, 1330], 54–60; and Fasīḥ al-Khvāfi, *Mujmal-i Fasīḥī*, 3:147).

34. Jean Aubin, "Un santón qubistānī de l'époque timouride," *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* 35 (1967): 208; Meier, 510, n. 241. Aubin is quoting, without page references, from ‘Alī b. Mahmūd Abīvardī Kūrānī's *Rawzat al-sālikīn*, a biography of the Naqshbandī ‘Alā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad Ābīzhī (d. 892/1487).

35. ‘Abd al-Husayn Navā‘ī, *Asnād va mukātabāt-i tārikhī-i Irān az Timūr tā Shāh Ismā‘īl*, 410–11; Meier, 505; n. 215.

36. Jāmī, *Nafahāt al-uns*, 14–15. It should be noted, however, that Jāmī bases his discussion mainly on al-Suhrawardī's *‘Awārif al-ma‘ārif*. Further, see Najm al-Dīn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad Rāzī "Dāyah," *The Path of God's Bondsmen from Origin to Return*, trans. Hamid Algar, index, s.v. "qalandar."

37. For the history of Qalandars in Iran during the Safavid period and beyond, see Iskandar Bag Munshī, *History of Shāh ‘Abbās the Great*, trans. Roger M. Savory, 1:195; Adam Olearius, *Vermehrte Neue Beschreibung der Muscovitischen und Persischen Reyse*, ed. Dieter Lohmeier, 685; Raphael Du Mans, *Estat de la Perse en 1660*, ed. Ch. Schefer, 216; Muḥammad Tāhir Naṣrābādī, *Tazkirah-i Naṣrābādī*, ed. Vahīd Dastgirdī, 264 (Bābā Sultān Qalandar, on whom see also Meier, 509, n. 2); Ma‘sum ‘Alī Shāh, *Tarīq al-ḥaqā‘iq*, 2:354, quoting from *Riyāz al-siyāḥah* (comp. 1237/1821–22) of Zayn al-‘Ābidīn ibn Iskandar Shīrvānī; the German translation of this passage appears in Meier, 510. One should also consult Gramlich, 1:70–82, who attempts to trace the early history of present-day Khāksār dervishes in Iran; cf. Zarrīnkūb, 92ff.

38. On La‘l Shāhbāz, see Baranī, 67–68; Ghulām Sarvar Lāhūrī, *Khazīnat al-asfiyā*, 2:46–47; Rizvi, 306 (relying on the *Ma‘ārij al-vilāyah* of Ghulām Mu‘īn al-Dīn ‘Abd Allāh Khvashgī); Digby, 70–71, 78, 100, 102 (relying on Baranī, 67–68; and *Tazkirah-i mashā‘ikh-i Sivistān*, ed. S. H. Rashdī [Mīhran, 1974], 205); Gramlich, 1:78 (note 48, relying on Lāhūrī, *Khazīnat al-asfiyā*, 2:46–47); Zarrīnkūb, 89; Meier, 508–9; and N. B. G. Qazī, *Lal Shahbaz Qalandar: ‘Uthman Marwandi*, where a few Persian poems attributed to La‘l Shāhbāz are reproduced (39–44). There is also a pamphlet entitled *Qalandar Lal Shahbaz* published by the Department of Public Relations, Government of Sind, which is not devoid of interest.

39. See Nizami, 295; Rizvi, 304; and Digby, 63, 84–85. All three scholars rely on the *Akhhār al-akhyār fī asrār al-abrār* (comp. 999/1590–91) of ‘Abd al-Haqq ibn Sayf al-Dīn al-Turk al-Dihlavi (d. 1052/1642–43); Rizvi also utilizes the *Mir‘āt al-asrār* (comp. 1065/1654) of ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Chishtī, Ms. British Library, for which see Charles Rieu, *Catalogue of the Persian Manuscripts in the British Museum*, 1:359b. To these, one could add the *Uṣūl al-maqṣūd* of Turāb ‘Alī Kākōravī (d. 1275/1858), as cited in Storey, 1035–37, no. 1378 (2).

40. See Khaliq Ahmad Nizami, "Abū ‘Alī Qalandar, Šaraf-al-Dīn Pānīpatī," in *EIR*, 1:258; Rizvi, 305; and Digby, 100–102.

41. When Bahā’ al-Dīn refused to give alms to a group of Qalandars, they started to hurl bricks at the door of his *khānqāh*; see Digby, 87; and Nizami, 295. A solitary Qalandar, angered that he was not allowed to consume his hemp-

drink in peace, wanted at first to strike a certain disciple of Bābā Farīd by the name of Badr al-Dīn Ishāq with his begger's bowl, but, at the intervention of Bābā Farīd himself, was content to crush his bowl against a wall; see Qalandar, 130-31; Digby, 88-89, and Nizami, 296. The same Bābā Farīd had another troublesome encounter with a Qalandar-like figure; see Digby, 92-93. Although Digby presents this incident as a murderous attack upon Bābā Farīd in keeping with the view expressed in his main source, it can certainly be interpreted as an innocuous visit by a dervish—most likely a Haydarī.

42. Baranī, 91-92; Digby, 63 and 71; and Rizvi, 304. Since metal paraphernalia was the chief characteristic not of Qalandars but of Haydarī dervishes, Baranī's use of the term Qalandar here is probably not accurate.

43. Qalandar, 6, 74, 112-13, 130-31, 250, 286-87; Digby, 71-72, 94-97. Hamīd Qalandar himself was a Qalandar who was "converted" at the time of Nizām al-Dīn Awliyā'. Naṣīr al-Dīn Chirāgh-i Dihlī was possibly subjected to a murderous attack by a Qalandar, though the identification of his assailant as a Qalandar remains quite problematic (in spite of Digby's opinion to the contrary).

44. Digby, 69, 78-80. A more detailed account of Qalandars in Muslim India of the seventh-eighth/thirteenth-fourteenth centuries is found in this study by Digby. For later history of the Qalandars in India, see, other than Digby, 69-70, 77, 99, the following works cited in Storey: *Uṣūl al-maṣṣūd* (comp. 1225-26/1810-11) of Turāb 'Alī Kākōravī, Storey, 1036, no. 1378; *al-Rawḍ al-azhar fī ma'āṣir al-Qalandar* of Taqī 'Alī Kākōravī (d. 1290/1873), Storey, 1046, no. 1399; *Bahr-i zakhkār* (comp. 1203/1788-89) of Wajīh al-Dīn Ashraf, Storey, 1031-32, no. 1374; *Tahṣīr al-anwar fī tafsīr al-qalandar* of 'Alī Anwar Qalandar ibn 'Alī Akbar, Storey, 1047, no. 1400 (2).

45. Baranī, 212. On Abū Bakr Ṭūsī, see Bruce B. Lawrence, "Abū Bakr Ṭūsī Haydarī," in *EIR*, 1:265. For later sources and detailed accounts of the Sīdī Muwallih affair, see Digby, 91-92; Nizami, 288-90; and Rizvi, 307-9. For other reports of Haydarīs in Indian-Persian Sufi literature, see references in Ahmad, *Intellectual History*, 45; and Nizami, 286. Nizami reports from Hamīd ibn Faḍl Allāh Jamālī's *Siyar al-Ārifīn* (Delhi, 1311/1893), 67, that the Haydarī practice of passing a lead ring through the urethra was known as *sikh muhr*, "skewer or pin seal." On Jamālī, see Storey, 968-72.

46. Baṭṭūṭah, 2:6-7, 3:439, and 4:61; see also 3:309-11.

47. A. S. Bazmee Ansari, "Badr al-Dīn," in *EI*, 1:858-59; 'Abd al-Rahmān al-Chishtī, *Mir'ās-i Madārī*, a full-scale sacred biography written in 1064/1654, for which see Rieu, *Persian Manuscripts*, 1:361a, 3:973a; and Storey, 1006; [Kaykhusraw Isfandiyār,] *Dabistān-i Mazāhib*, ed. Raḥīm Rizāzāda Malik, 1:190-91; H. A. Rose, ed., *A Glossary of the Tribes and Castes of the Punjab and North-West Frontier Province*, 3:43-44; Rizvi, 318-20; M. M. Haq, "Shāh Badī' al-Dīn Madār and His Ṭariqah in Bengal," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Pakistan* 12 (1967): 95-110. For Madārīs in recent times, see Marc Gaborieau, *Minorités musulmanes dans le royaume hindou du Nepal*, 122-27; and Kathy Ewing, "Malangs of the Punjab: Intoxication or Adab as the Path to God?" in *Moral Conduct and Authority: The Place of (Adab) in South Asian Islam*, ed. Barbara Daly Metcalf, 357-71. Cf. Jamini Mohan Ghosh, *Sannyasi and Fakir Raiders in Bengal*.

48. A. S. Bazmee Ansari, "Djalāl al-Dīn Husayn al-Bukhārī," in *EI*, 2:392; Lāhūrī, *Khazīnat al-aṣfiyā'*, 2:35-38; *Dabistān-i Mazāhib*, 1:191-92; Shīrvānī, *Bustān al-siyāḥah*, 152-53; Rizvi, 8, 277-82, and 320; Ahmad, *Intellectual History*, 44; Zarrīnkūb, 91-92; Baṭṭūṭah, 2:282; and Gramlich, 1:71-73.

Jāmī had
877-78/
ast clear
lly long
ū 1, 477.
yn Kūhī
47).
evue des
without
ālikīn, a
187).
'īmūr tā

nī bases
lajm al-
ien from

od and
Roger
itischen
la Perse
ṣābādī,
r, 509,
siyāḥah
ierman
onsult
nt-day

īnat al-
Mu'īn
īaranī,
1974],
5-47);
'ihman
duced
oy the
levoid

olars
od al-
tilizes
ritish
in the
'Alī

atī,"

they
295.
mp-

49. Ebü'l Hayr Rûmî, *Şaltuknâme*, fols. 364b-65b, reports the presence of Qalandars in these towns during the time of Sultan 'Alâ' al-Dîn Kayqubâd (r. 616-34/1219-37).

50. Aflâkî, 2:596 (3/581). Abû Bakr immediately ordered the bull to be sacrificed and distributed to the needy.

51. Ibid., 1:412 (3/355). Also Jalâl al-Dîn Muhammad ibn Muhammad Balkhî Rûmî, known as Mawlânâ, *Maṣnavî-i ma'navî*, ed. Reynold A. Nicholson, 1:18. For other references to Qalandars in the works of Rûmî, see Abdûlbaki Gölpınarlı, *Mevlânâ Celâleddîn: Hayatı, Felsefesi, Eserleri, Eserlerinden Seçmeler*, 61-63.

52. Aflâkî, 1:215 (3/123) and 467-68 (3/437). Al-Aflâkî also records an anecdote concerning Muḥammad Ḥaydarî, a disciple of Hâjjî Mubârak, 2:773-74.

53. *Vilâyetnâme*, 64.

54. On the meaning of the word *barâq*, see Robert Dankoff, "Barâq and Burâq," *Central Asiatic Journal* 15 (1971): 111. For references on Şarî Şaltuk, to whom the *Şaltuknâme* is dedicated, see Machiel Kiel, "The Türbe of Sarî Saltık at Badabag-Dobrudja: Brief Historical and Architectonical Notes," *Güney Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi* 6-7 (1977-78): 205-25; a short biography of this figure is given in Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "Early Sufism in Eastern Anatolia," in *Classical Persian Sufism: From Its Origins to Rumi*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn, 193-96.

55. Algar, "Barâq Bâbâ," 3:754-55. Algar supplies copious references, to which should be added Abdûlbaki Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre: Hayatı*, 39-47; and Donald P. Little, "Religion under the Mamlûks," *Muslim World* 73 (1983): 175-76; both Gölpınarlı and Little use additional Mamlûk sources not cited by Algar.

56. A description of Barâq Baba and his dervishes is given above in chapter 1.

57. The Persian original of Quṭb al-'Alavî's commentary along with a complete translation into Turkish is given in Abdûlbaki Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*, 457-72 and 255-75, respectively.

58. On Yunus Emre, see Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre ve Tasavvuf*, where Taptuk Emre is also discussed, 41-43.

59. This information on the dervishes of Abdâl Mûsâ is contained in a famous poem by Kaygusuz Abdâl; see Sadeddin Nüzhet Ergun, *Türk Şairleri*, 1:166; and Abdûlbaki Gölpınarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal, Hatayı, Kul Himmət*, 34-35. Cf. Kaygusuz Abdâl, *Kaygusuz Abdal'ın Mensur Eserleri*, ed. Abdurrahman Güzel, 23, which contains a slightly different version with some better readings; for instance "Alvan gölü" (a lake in Antalya, Kaygusuz Abdâl's hometown) instead of the usual "elvân gölü." There is also a short sacred biography of Abdâl Mûsâ, reproduced in Ergun, *Türk Şairleri*, 1:166-69, which is not very informative.

60. See the poems of Kaygusuz in Gölpınarlı, *Kaygusuz Abdal*, especially nos. 6 (40-42), 7 (42-43), and 9 (46-48).

61. A list of Kaygusuz Abdâl's works is provided in Abdurrahman Güzel, *Kaygusuz Abdal (Alâeddin Gaybî) Bibliyografyası*. The summary of his views is based on his published prose works; see Kaygusuz Abdâl, *Mensur Eserleri*.

62. Orhan Köprülü, "Velâyet-nâme-i Sultan Şücaeddin," *Türkiyat Mecmuası* 17 (1972): 177-84, where other references on Sultân Şücâ' can be found. To these one should add Abdâl, fol. 7b. On Hâcî Bayram, see Fuat Bayramoğlu, *Hacı Bayram-i Veli: Yaşamı, Soyu, Vakfı*. Ümmî Kemâl is discussed in William C. Hickmann, "Who Was Ümmî Kemal?" *Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Dergisi* 4-5 (1976-77): 57-82. On Nesimî, see Kathleen R. F. Burrill, *The Quatrains of Nesimî: Fourteenth Century Turcic Hürufî*.

63. For details of the Şeyh Şücâ' complex, see Ayverdi, 2:420-21; also

Tayyib Gökbilgin, XV–XVI. Asırlarda Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı: Vakıflar, Mülkler, Mukataalar, 34.

6. DERVISH GROUPS IN THE OTTOMAN EMPIRE, 1450–1550

1. For previous surveys of the topic, see Ocak and Colin H. Imber, "The Wandering Dervishes," in *Mashriq: Proceedings of the Eastern Mediterranean Seminar, University of Manchester, 1977–78*, 36–50.

2. Theodoro Spandugino, *I commentari di Theodoro Spandugino Cantacuscino Gentilhuomo Costantinopolitano, dell'origine de' principi turchi, & de' costumi di quella nazione*, 193–94; contemporary French translation: *Petit traité de l'origine des Turcs par Théodore Spandouyn Cantacasin*, trans. Balarin de Raconis, ed. Charles Schefer, 224–28.

3. Menavino, 79–82; German translation, 36b–37b. The relevant passage is translated in full in chapter 1 above.

4. Vahidî, fols. 28a–31b. It should be pointed out that Vahidî himself was a respectable Sufi who did not approve of the Qalandarî path.

5. *Fatih Mehmed II Vakıfları*, facsimile, 175–77; transliterated text, 259–60 (paragraphs 323–28). On closer scrutiny, it appears possible that this structure was a hospice for Mevlevîs. In any case, the building was soon converted into a religious college (*madrasah*) and a mosque; see the interpretation in Ayverdi, 3:428 (entries 456–58). Also Nejat Göyünç, "Kalenderhane Câmîi," *Tarih Dergisi* 34 (1984): 485–94; and Wolfgang Müller-Wiener, *Bildlexicon zur Topographie Istanbuls: Byzantion—Konstantinupolis—Istanbul bis zum Beginn des 17. Jahrhunderts*, 153–58.

6. Tayyib Gökbilgin, "XVI. asırda Karaman eyaleti ve Lârende (Karaman) vakıf ve müesseseleri," *Vakıflar Dergisi* 7 (1968): 38, no. 40.

7. For the *kalenderhânes* in Birgi and Konya, of uncertain dates, see Ömer Lütfi Barkan, "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir iskân ve kolonizasyon metodu olarak vakıflar ve temlikler: 1, İstilâ devirlerinin kolonizatör Türk dervişleri ve zâviyeler," *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942): 327; and Semavi Eyice, "Kırşehir'de Karakurt (Kalender Baba) İhcası," *İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Tarih Enstitüsü Dergisi* 2 (1971): 247–48, no. 40. The *kalenderhâne* in Bursa is cited in Evliyâ, 2:18, and the one in Erzincan is recorded in a pious endowment (*waqf*) document dated 937/1530; see İsmet Miroğlu, *Kemah Sancağı ve Erzincan Kazası (1520–1566)*, 152.

8. Edirneli Mecdî, *Hadâ'ikü's-şakâ'ik*, ed. Mehmed Recâ'î under the title *Terceme-i şakâ'ik-i nu'mâniye*, 225.

9. Yûsuf ibn Ya'kûb, *Menâkıb-i şerîf ve tarikatnâme-i pîrân ve meşâyih-i tarikat-i 'âlîye-i halvetiye*, 38–39.

10. Celâlzâde Muştafâ, known as Koca Nişancı, *Geschichte Sultan Süleymân Kânûnîs von 1520 bis 1557 oder Tabâkât ül-memâlik ve derecât ül-mesâlik von Celâlzâde Muştafâ genannt Koca Nişancı*, ed. Petra Kappert, 348b. Qalandars continued to exist in the Ottoman Empire after the mid-tenth/sixteenth century. Later European accounts rely mostly on Menavino (this is also true for other dervish groups). Nicolas de Nicolay, who was in Istanbul in 1551 (Nicolas, 189–91; English translation, 104–5; Salomon Schweigger, in Istanbul between January 1578 and May 1581 (*Ein neue Reyssbeschreibung auss Teutschland nach Constantinopel und Jerusalem*, 195–97); and Michel Baudier de Languedoc, whose work first appeared in 1625 (*Histoire générale de la religion des Turcs*, 386–96), all repeat

Menavino in either synoptic or extended versions. Sir Paul Rychaut (*History*, 258-60), who was in Asia Minor during the reign of Mehmed IV (1058-99/1648-87), apparently based his description on his own observations. Barthélemy d'Herbelot (*Bibliothèque Orientale*, 244) is general and vague on Qalandars. A century later, Mouradja d'Ohsson (*Tableau général de l'Empire Ottoman*, vol. 4, pt. 1, 684-85) seems to be the first to mention a certain "Youssouph Endeloussy" as the alleged founder of the Qalandars. His claim was taken over by some later authors; see, for instance, Rose's note to Brown's text in John Brown, *Darvishes*, 169-72, n. 1 (chapter 11 of this book is a reproduction of d'Ohsson's account of dervishes and Sufi orders); also Le Châtelier, *Les confrères musulmanes du Hedjaz*, 253-56; and Trimmingham, 268-69. On the Ottoman side, the most significant source of recent times, Harîrîzâde Mehmed Kemâleddin, *Tibyân wasâ'il al-haqâ'iq fî bayân salâsil al-tarâ'iq*, Ms. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi, Ibrahim Efendi 430-32 (late 13th/19th century), 3:74b-77a, devotes a few pages to Qalandariyah, where passages from Jâmi's *Nafahât al-uns*, Tabrizî's *Burhân-i qâfi*, Ibn Battûṭah's travelogue, and al-Maqrîzî's *al-Mawâ'iz* are quoted. The author himself thinks Qalandariyah to be a branch of the Mevleviye that was formed by Dîvâne Mehmed Çelebi. For detailed information on this person, see Gölpınarlı, 101-22. Mehmed Çelebi seems to have been not a Qalandar but a Shams-i Tabrizî; see the section on Shams-i Tabrizîs below in this chapter.

11. Spandugino, *Commentari*, 192; French translation: *Petit traité*, 220 (read "Calenderi" in place of "Dynamies" in the French translation).

12. It is difficult to decipher the Turkish original of this sentence. The best I can offer here is "Geda olmak dilersen özini alçaklık gör" (If you want to become a beggar, you should be humble).

13. Menavino, 75-76; German translation, 35a. Menavino's description is reproduced almost word by word in Nicolas, 182-83; English translation, 101.

14. Vâhidî, fols. 53b-58a.

15. On the *tâj-i Haydarî*, see Iskandar Bag Munshî, *History of Shâh 'Abbâs the Great*, 1:31; and Abdülhakî Gölpınarlı, "Kızılbaş," in *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 6:789. Also cf. Adel Allouche, "The Origins and Development of the Ottoman-Safavid Conflict (906-962/1500-1555)," 118, n. 94.

16. Colin H. Imber, "The Persecution of the Ottoman Shi'ites according to the Mühimme Defterleri, 1565-1585," *Der Islam* 56 (1979): 245-73.

17. Gökbiçgin, "Karaman eyaleti," 38, n. 41, where it is reported as "vaḳf-i zâviye-i hayderhâne der nezd-i Alacaşoluk" (in Lârende), with a total income of 3,265 *akçes*; and Miroğlu, *Kemah Sancağı*, 152.

18. Ahmed Refik, *Onuncu 'asr-i hicrîde İstanbul hayatı (961-1000)*, 209; Suraiya Faroqhi, *Der Bektaschi-Orden in Anatolien (vom späten fünfzehnten Jahrhundert bis 1826)*, 31-32. I follow Faroqhi's dating. It should be pointed out here that the *haydarhâne* in Lârende might conceivably not have been a hospice for Haydarî dervishes but only named after its founder, a certain Haydar. For examples of such cases, see Hâfiz Hüseyin ibn İsmâ'il Ayvânsarayî, *Ḥadikatü'l-cevâmî*, 1:88, 89, 94, and 95; also Mehmed Süreyyâ, *Sicill-i 'Osmânî or Tezkire-i meşâhîr-i 'Osmâniye*, 2:442, on "Hayder Hüseyin Ağa," who is said to have founded a hospice (*dergâh*) in his name.

19. Oruç ibn 'Âdil, *Tevârîḫ-i âl-i 'Osmân*, ed. Franz Babinger, 138; German translation: *Der Fromme Sultan Bayezid: Die Geschichte seiner Herrschaft (1481-1512) nach den altosmanischen Chroniken des Oruç und des Anonymus Hanivaldanus*, trans. Richard F. Kreutel, 59-61. Oruç writes that the assassin had the appearance of a

Haydarî, with earrings and an iron collar around his neck; he wore a felt coat. Later Ottoman chronicles, listed in Sohrweide, "Der Sieg der Safaviden," 138, are vague and refer to the assassin merely as a Qalandar.

20. "Do you, friends, know what a Haydarî is? Getting intoxicated on a preparation of hashish, they roam the city and [its] markets, constantly reciting poems in couplets. Contented [to be] in the hospice of this world, some are hemp-addicts and others Abdâls" (Fakîrî, *Ta'rifât*, Ms. İstanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, TY 3051 [undated], fol. 13b).

21. Nişancı, 234-37. The dervishes described by Küçük Nişancı wear iron rings on their ears and around their necks as well as little bells on their shoulders and chests.

22. 'Âşık, fol. 270b. The accounts in other sources on Hayâlî Beg are not as informative as 'Âşık Çelebi's; see Sehi Beg, *Hest bihişt*, ed. Günay Kut, fols. 112a-b; Laîfî, 150-51; Kınalızâde, 1:354-60; 'Ahdî Ahmed Çelebi, *Gülşen-i şu'arâ*, Ms. British Library, Add. 7876 (undated), fol. 72b; Mustafa 'Âlî, *Künhü'l-ahbâr*, Ms. British Library, Or. 32 (undated), fol. 278b; and Riyâzî Mehmed, *Riyâzü's-su'arâ*, Ms. British Library, Or. 13501 (dated 1337/1918-19, copyist Ahmed 'Izzet), fol. 65b.

23. For Hayderî, see Ergun 2, 1:73-76; and 'Âşık, fol. 90a. Cf. Kınalızâde, 1:314, though it is not clear if Kınalızâde is reporting on the same Hayderî. Meşrebî, who died in 962/1554-55, is said to have been a disciple of the same Bâbâ 'Âlî Mest, the master of Hayâlî; see Sehi, *Hest bihişt*, fol. 116b; Laîfî, 311-12; 'Âşık, fol. 124a; and Kınalızâde, 2:903.

24. On the Arabic term *abdâl* (pl. of *badal*, literally "substitute") as used in Sufism, see Ignaz Goldziher, "Abdâl," in *El*, 1:94-95; and Köprülü 2, 23-29. On the possible origins and meaning of the Turkish word *ışık* ("bright, gleaming; brightness, gleam"; cf. Clauson, *Etymological Dictionary*, 977, col. 1), see Abdül-baki Gölpınarlı, *Yunus Emre Divanı: Metinler, Sözlük, Açıklama*, 677-79. One could speculate that the usage of this term, at least initially, was not unrelated to the practice of *chahâr zarb*, whereby "the sun that is the face" was made to "shine in all its brightness." However, an altogether different etymology that sees the Arabic word *shaykh* at the root of the Turkish *ışık* has been proposed by Köprülü 2, 36. On Seyyid Battâl Gâzî, see M. Canard and I. Mélikoff, "Battâl," in *El*, 1:1102-4; and Pertev Naili Boratav, "Battal," in *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 1:344-51.

25. Vâhidî, fols. 41a-47a.

26. On the significance and origins of the hatchet of Abû Muslim in the Turko-Iranian cultural sphere, see Irène Mélikoff, *Abu Muslim, le "Porte-Hache" du Khorassan dans la tradition épique turco-iranienne*. The word *şücâ'î* (literally "serpent-like" or "relating to heroes, heroic") was used most likely in honor and memory of the early Abdâl master Sulţân Şücâ'; see the section on Anatolia in chapter 5.

27. Menavino, 76-79; German translation, 35b-36b. The assassination attempt in question was carried out against Bâyezîd II in the year 897/1492 by a dervish portrayed as a Haydarî; see the section on Haydarîs above in this chapter.

28. Nicolas, 185-88; English translation, 102-3.

29. Konstantin Mihailović, *Memoirs of a Janissary*, trans. Benjamin Stolz, 69. Even though Mihailović confuses the Abdâls with the Haydarîs on two occasions (the sentences "And they gird themselves with chains in criss-cross fashion" and "And they sheathe their instrumentum, alias penis, in iron"), his "derwissler" are clearly the Abdâls.

story,
3-99/
flemy
rs. A
ol. 4,
ussy"
; later
ishes,
int of
edjaz,
ficant
aqâ'iq
30-32
where
ûṭah's
hinks
ivâne
11-22.
zi; see

(read

best I
come

ion is
101.

bās the
6:789.
afavid

ing to

vakf-i
me of

uraiya
tert bis
iat the
laydarî
ples of
, 1:88,
eşâhîr-i
nded a

erman
-1512)
trans.
ce of a

30. In a well-known passage, 'Āşıkpaşazāde refers to Abdālān-i Rūm in passing as one of the four groups of travelers in Asia Minor: *Die Altosmanische Chronik der 'Āşıkpaşazāde*, ed. Friedrich Giese, 201. Fakīrī, *Ta'rifāt*, fol. 13a, produces the following definition for *ışık*: "An *ışık* is one who has gone astray from the [right] path; all are sodomites, hashish-addicts, and outlaws. So burned and consumed are they with the love of 'Alī that they have assumed eighteen different forms in this world. At their sides are hashish-containers; one would take them to be bitches of Kerbelā." In three further couplets (fol. 13b), Fakīrī provides additional information on the *köçeks* (the youths mentioned in Menavino's account quoted above): "In the resting-place that is the world, *köçeks* are those who wait [in attendance] at the side of *babas*. Whenever [the *baba*] so wishes they go into a [special] state [an allusion to sexual intercourse] and become Abdāls with such humility. They are the lamps of the hospice of time; their beds are the sheepskin [seats] of the *babas*." Köprülü 2, 31, gives the faulty reading "*ışık oldur k'olamaz hep de hāric*" for the first verse of the first definition; the correct reading is "*ışık oldur k'ola mezhebden hāric*." Nişāncı, 234, makes it known in two separate couplets that Abdāls shave their heads and do not wear any headgear. Cf. the first couplet of Küçük Nişāncı with Ḥayālī Beg, *Ḥayālī Bey Divānı*, ed. Ali Nihat Tarlan, 446, Mukatta'at 9, Muṣṭafā 'Alī, *Hulāsatü'l-ahvāl*, ed. Andreas Tietze in "The Poet as Critique of Society: A 16th-Century Ottoman Poem," *Turcica* 9 (1977): 135, verses 138-39, contains two verses on *ışık*: "If you are inclined to become an *ışık*, you would be afflicted with fever and sighs from head to foot; wandering about barefoot and head uncovered in summer and winter, you would yearn after hemp-drink and hashish."

31. On Hasan Rūmī, see Laṭīfī, 131. On Seher Abdāl, see Ergun 1, 1:88-95; and Abdūlbaki Gölpınarlı, *Alevī-Bektaşī Nefesleri*, 18. For Şirī, see Ergun 1, 1:116-25; and Gölpınarlı, *Alevī-Bektaşī Nefesleri*, 177-78. It seems possible that Seher Abdāl and Şirī lived later than the tenth/sixteenth century. Muḥyiddīn Abdāl was a disciple of Akyazılı Sultān, and Feyzī Ḥasan Baba of Otman Baba (on Akyazılı, see the section on Abdāls of Rūm below in this chapter); see Ergun 1, 1:141-55; and Gölpınarlı, *Alevī-Bektaşī Nefesleri*, 16.

32. Laṭīfī, 141-43; 'Āşık, fol. 175a; and Kınalızāde, 2:632. Cf. Ergun 2, 2:505-8.

33. 'Ahdī, *Gülşen-i şu'arā*, fol. 149a; Ergun 1, 1:81-83, quoting from 'Ahdī. Kelāmī was alive and a resident of the Karbalā hospice when 'Ahdī wrote his entry on him, which could have been any time between 971/1563-64, the first completion of the *Gülşen-i şu'arā*, and 1001/1592-93, the date of 'Ahdī's latest addition to his work; see Agah Sırrı Levend, *Türk Edebiyatı Tarihi*, vol. 1, Giriş, 270-71. Apparently, Gelibolulu Muṣṭafā 'Alī appointed Kelāmī the administrator of his pious endowment at Karbalā; see Cornell H. Fleischer, *Bureaucrat and Intellectual in the Ottoman Empire: The Historian Mustafa Ali (1541-1600)*, 124, n. 38.

34. 'Āşık, fol. 95b.

35. Yemīnī. For a brief description of *Fazilet-nāme*'s contents, see Charles Rieu, *Catalogue of the Turkish Manuscripts in the British Museum* 173-74, ms. Add. 19805. On Akyazılı Sultān, see this section below.

36. Şemsī is recorded in Laṭīfī, 209-10; 'Āşık, fol. 205a; and Kınalızāde, 1:521. According to Laṭīfī, he died before the end of the reign of Sultan Selīm I. For the relevant verses of the *Deh murğ*, see Şemsī, *Deh murğ*, (1) Ms. British

Library,
Bakir ib
Library,
preserve
ve 'Deh

37. (

poems (

M. Ali

kaşide ne

i bī-ser i

38. S

keyfiyye

yine hay

39. F

could be

poets m

Laṭīfī, 1

fol. 88a,

40. 7

41. S

şakā'ik,

42. V

disciple

Dihkhue

43. S

44. F

of these

as Seen

tekke is

Theodo

für Orien

Selim D

found in

45. F

the nar

Faroghī

in the es

938/153

right to

46. S

Köprülü

47. F

48. 1

49. I

seventee

Covel,

Kalende

in all th

santons,

tyed abc

Library, Or. 7113, fols. 130b-50b (dated 998/1589-90, copyist 'Abdülkerim ibn Bâkir ibn İbrâhîm ibn İskender ibn 'Abdullâh), fols. 140a-b; and (2) Ms. British Library, Or. 7203, (undated), fols. 12b-14b, though the two copies consulted preserve only a very corrupt text. I could not consult İ. G. Kaya, "Derviş Şemsi ve 'Deh Murg,'" *Sesler* 19 (1983): 103-17.

37. On Hayretî, see the introduction to the critical edition of his collection of poems (*divân*) in Hayretî, *Divân: Tenkidli Basım*, ed. Mehmed Çavuşoğlu and M. Ali Tanyeri, X-XVII. Most important in connection with the *Abdâls* are *kaşide* no. 8 (19-21), entitled "Der beyân-i seyr ü sülûk-i abdâl-i Hüdâ ve 'uşşâk-i bî-ser ü pâ," and *musammat*s nos. 11 through 15 (91-99).

38. See in particular *musammat* no. 13, Hayretî, *Divân*, 94-95, entitled "Der keyfiyyet-i beng ve hâlet-i esrâr güyed," with the refrain "Cur'adanı getür abdâl yine hayrân olalum."

39. Hayretî, *Divân*, 19, verses 8 and 4, respectively. Cf. verses 6 and 7. It could be added here that Köprülü, who first drew attention to some of the *Abdâl* poets mentioned above, was of the opinion that Hüseyinî of Rumeli, noted by Laṭîfî, 132, was also an *Abdâl*. The more detailed entry on this poet in 'Aşık, fol. 88a, however, proves Hüseyinî to have been a mere plagiarist.

40. The two poems in question can be found in Ergun 2, 1:234-39.

41. See 'Atâ'ullâh ibn Yahyâ Nev'izâde, *Hadâ'ikü'l-hakâ'ik fî tekmileti's-şakâ'ik*, ed. Mehmed Recâî, 56.

42. Vahidî, fol. 28b, 1.8, and elsewhere, consistently defines *müfred* as the disciple "who sits below the master, that is, the 'second-in-charge.'" See Dihkhudâ, s.v. "Mufrad" for this meaning of the word.

43. 'Aşık, fol. 175a-b.

44. For details as well as references to earlier studies, see the thorough study of these documents in Suraiya Faroqhi, "Seyyid Gazi Revisited: The Foundation as Seen through Sixteenth Century Documents," *Turcica* 13 (1981): 90-122. The *tekke* is said to have been founded by Mehmed ibn 'Ali Miḥal in 917/1511; see Theodor Menzel, "Das Bektâşî-Kloster Sejjid-i Ghâzî," *Mitteilungen des Seminars für Orientalische Sprachen* 28 (1925): 113; and İ. Aydın Yüksel, II. *Bayezid-Yavuz Selim Devri* (continuation of Ayverdi), 317. Evliyâ Çelebi's account is to be found in Evliyâ, 3:13-14.

45. Faroqhi, "Seyyid Gazi Revisited," 94. The document in question contains the names and posts of forty-eight servants of the institution. Significantly, Faroqhi reads the document to mean that "there was no hereditary master, *şeyh*," in the establishment and, relying on two further documents (dated 937/1530 and 938/1531-32, respectively), goes on to state that the resident "dervishes had the right to elect their own *şeyh*," (95).

46. 'Aşık, fol. 175b; Nev'izâde, *Hadâ'ikü'l-hakâ'ik*, 56; Nişancı, 234-37; and Köprülü 2, 32.

47. Faroqhi, "Seyyid Gazi Revisited," 101-5.

48. Ibid., 113.

49. Individual *Abdâls* continued to exist during and after the eleventh/seventeenth century. Witness, for instance, the following report of Dr. John Covell, who was in Turkey between 1670 and 1679 C.E.: "I remember two Kalenderis aboard the Viner . . . ; they had the caps of a wandering Dervise, but in all things else like the habit of the Kalenderi, in Mr. Rycout, he makes them santons, but in good earnest they are meer Tomes of Bedlam. One had a horne tyed about his shoulders (like a wild goates but longer); he blew it like our sow

gelders, high to low. He had a great hand jar, a terrible crab-tree truncheon, a leather kind of petticoat about his middle, naked above and beneath. It was then in May or June. He had a coarse Arnout Jamurluck. He drank wine (like a fish water) which we gave him to blow his horn" (J. Theodore Bent, ed., *Early Voyages in the Levant*: 1. *The Diary of Master Thomas Dallam, 1599-1600*; 2. *Extracts from the Diaries of Dr. John Covel, 1670-1679*, 153). Cf. the observations of Adam Olearius, who saw Shī'ī Abdāls in Iran during his travels in that country in 1637 (*Neue Beschreibung*, 684-85). One could also draw attention to the confusing testimony of Sieur du Loir in a letter that he wrote from Istanbul in 1640 (*Les voyages du Sieur du Loir*, 149-59). For a much more recent report, see Brown, *Darvishes*, 93.

50. Menzel, "Das Bektāšī-Kloster," 120-25; Yüksel, *II. Bayezid-Yavuz Selim Devri*, 212.

51. Vāhidī, fol. 42b, line 11. 'Uryān Baba, however, expressly pays allegiance to Otman Baba and Sultān Şücā': fol. 42b, lines 7-8.

52. Filiz Aydın, "Seyitgazi Aslanbey köyünde 'Şeyh Şücaeddin' külliyesi," *Vakıflar Dergisi* 9 (1971): 201-25.

53. For a picture of this hospice, see Semavi Eyice, "Varna ile Balçık arasında Akyazılı Sultan Tekkesi," *Bellesten* 31 (1967): 551-600, picture 20; for the location, *ibid.*, 562. For historical attestations, see Barkan, "Türk dervişleri," 340-41, no. 178; Ayverdi, 4:45, no. 669; Evliyā, 8:766; and Sevim İlgürel, "Hıbrî'nin 'Enis'ül-müsâmirin'i," *Güney Doğu Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi* 2-3 (1973-74): 146, no. 53 (reporting from Hıbrî's *Enis'ül-müsâmirin*, comp. 1046/1636-37).

54. Yemîni, 83.

55. For an architectural evaluation as well as references to primary sources, including Evliyā Çelebi, see Eyice, "Akyazılı Sultan Tekkesi"; also Ayverdi, 4:16-18, pictures 7-12. A short biography of Akyazılı Sultān himself appears in "Akyazılı Sultan," *TA*, 1:395 (probably by Gölpınarlı). It seems certain that Kudemli Baba, whose *tekke* is still standing in Kalugerevo-Nove Zagora in Bulgaria, was also a disciple of either Otman Baba or Akyazılı Sultān. It is telling in this respect that the tomb of Kudemli Baba, just like that of Akyazılı Sultān, is a heptagonal structure; see Machiel Kiel, "Bulgaristan'da eski Osmanlı mimarisinin bir yapıtı: Kalugerevo-Nova Zagora'daki Kudemli Baba Sultan bektāšī tekkesi," *Bellesten* 35 (1971): 45-60.

56. Franz Babinger, "Koyun Baba," in *EI*, 5:283; Faroqhi, *Bektaschi-Orden*, 134, n. 3; Evliyā, 2:180ff. A hagiography of Koyun Baba entitled *Manzûme-i tercüme-i menâkıb-i Koyun Baba* exists in Çorum Merkez Genel Kütüphanesi, Ms. 1217, though this work could not be consulted in time for inclusion in the present study.

57. See, for instance, Klaus Kreiser, "Deñiz Abdāl—ein Derwisch unter drei Sultanen," *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* 76 (1986): 199-207.

58. Spandugino, *Commentari*, 192; French translation: *Petit traité*, 220, where one should read "Diunami" in place of "Calender."

59. Vāhidī, fols. 66a-70a.

60. Menavino, 72-74; German translation, 34a-b.

61. Nicolas, 178-80; English translation, 99-100. The only significant addition of Nicolas, other than his drawing reproduced in plate 4, was to state that the apparel of Jāmīs was "a little cassock without sleeves . . . made and fashioned untoo a deacons coate, so short, that it cometh but to aboue theyr knees." For other, less revealing, references to Jāmīs, see Faḳīrī, *Tā'rifāt*, fol. 13b; Nişancı, 235; and Celālzāde Muştafā, *Geschichte Sultan Süleymān Kānūnīs*, 348b.

62. Fritz Meier, "Ahmad-i Djām," in *EI*, 1:283-84, succinctly summarizes the earlier studies on Ahmad of Jām, the most important of which are Wladimir Ivanow, "A Biography of Shaykh Ahmad-i Jām," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (1917): 291-365; and Fritz Meier, "Zur Biographie Ahmad-i Gām's und zur Quellenkunde von Gāmī's Nafahātu'l-uns," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 97 (1943): 47-67. One should now consult the introductions to the following published works of Ahmad of Jām: *Miftāḥ al-najāt*, ed. 'Alī Fāzil; and *Rawzat al-muḥnibīn wa jannat al-mushtāqīn*, ed. 'Alī Fāzil. His sacred biography is also available in print: Khvājah Sayyid al-Dīn Muḥammad Ghaznavī, *Maqāmāt-i Zhandah'Pīl*, ed. Hishmat Allāhi Mu'ayyad Sanandajī.

63. On this collection of poems (*divān*), see Ahmad of Jām, *Miftāḥ al-najāt*, 24-29; and Ghaznavī, *Maqāmāt-i Zhandah'Pīl*, 24-37. Fāzil, the editor of *Miftāḥ al-najāt*, believes the greater part of the work to be authentic. Meier, "Ahmad-i Djām"; H. Mu'ayyad, the editor of *Maqāmāt-i Zhandah'Pīl*; and Zarrīnkūb, *Justujū*, 83, however, are highly suspicious of the attribution of the whole *divān* to Ahmad. A rather ecstatic picture of Ahmad of Jām is preserved in Qalandar, 177.

64. On Ahmad's progeny, see Ahmad of Jām, *Rawzat al-muḥnibīn*, 25-57; and Ghaznavī, *Maqāmāt-i Zhandah'Pīl*, 37-38. The descendants of Ahmad have been studied by Lawrence G. Potter, "The Kart Dynasty of Herat: Religion and Politics in Medieval Iran."

65. Vāhidī, fols. 80b-84a.

66. *Ibid.*, fols. 89a-94a.

67. See Gölpınarlı, 204-43. Ulu 'Arif Çelebi is discussed on 65-95, Dīvāne Mehmed Çelebi on 101-22, Yūsuf Sineçāk (the brother of the Abdāl poet Ḥayretī discussed in the section on Abdāl of Rūm in this chapter above on 124-27), and Şāhidī on 132-40. A summary of Gölpınarlı's account is available in Victoria Rowe Holbrook, "Diverse Tastes in the Spiritual Life: Textual Play in the Diffusion of Rumi's Order," in *The Legacy of Mediaeval Persian Sufism*, ed. Leonard Lewisohn, 99-120. On the Mevlevīye in general, see also Tahsin Yazıcı, D. S. Margoliouth, and Frederick De Jong, "Mawlawiyya," in *EI*, 6:883-88.

68. The institutional history of the order is studied in detail in Faroqhi, *Der Bektaschi-Orden*, which includes a comprehensive bibliography of modern studies. The most comprehensive study of Bektāshī belief and practice is still John Kingsley Birge, *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*. Cf. also "Bektāshilik," in *TA*, 6:34-38 (probably by A. Gölpınarlı).

69. Vāhidī, fols. 74a-80b.

70. The differences are outlined in Ahmet T. Karamustafa, "Kalenders, Abdāl, Ḥayderīs: The Formation of the Bektāshīye in the Sixteenth Century," in *Süleymān the Second [sic] and His Time*, ed. Halil İnalcık and Cemal Kafadar, 121-29.

71. For details on Janissary-Bektāshī relations, see Köprülü 1, 405-8; and İsmail Hakkı Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı Devleti Teşkilatından Kapıkulu Ocakları*, 1:147-50. A recent evaluation is Irène Mélikoff, "Un ordre des derviches colonisateurs, les Bektachis: Leur rôle social et leurs rapports avec les premiers sultans ottomans," in *Mémorial Ömer Lütfi Barkan*, 149-57. On Ḥacı Bektāş, see Karamustafa, "Early Sufism in Eastern Anatolia," 186-90. The earliest clear evidence for Janissary allegiance to Ḥacı Bektāş dates back only to the time of Mehmed II (2d r. 855-86/1451-81); see Abdāl, fol. 93a, where the soldier accompanying Otman Baba to Istanbul at the orders of Mehmed II declares that his headgear is modeled after that of Ḥacı Bektāş.

72. The argument for the formation of the Bektāṣī order in the manner described here is presented in detail in Karamustafa, "*Kalenders, Abdāls, Hayderis*."

7. RENUNCIATION IN THE LATER MIDDLE PERIOD

1. Hodgson 2:1-151; Lapidus, *A History of Islamic Societies*, 137-224.
2. The only independent full-scale study of the subject is still Trimingham. Cf. Hodgson, 2:201-54.
3. Trimingham, 10-16.
4. Ibid., 166-217.
5. Reeves, *The Hidden Government*, 1. Cf. Hodgson, 2:217-18. Trimingham's description of the final stage in the organizational history of Sufism—the formation of *ṭāʾifas*—has the disadvantage of concealing the analytical distinction between the *ṭariqah* and the cult of saints; see Trimingham, 67-104.
6. Two recent studies on the history of the saint cult in Islam are Taylor, "The Cult of the Saints"; and Vincent Cornell, "Mirrors of Prophethood: The Evolving Image of the Spiritual Master in the Western Maghrib from the Origins of Sufism to the End of the 16th Century."
7. On Ayyūbid patronage of the Sufis, see Ramazan Şeşen, *Salāhaddīn Devrinde Eyyübiler Devleti*, 263-66; on *khānqāhs* in Mamlūk Egypt, see Leonor Fernandes, *The Evolution of a Sufi Institution in Mamluk Egypt: The Khanqah*; Cf. Pouzet, 210-13; and Donald P. Little, "The Nature of *Khānqāhs*, *Ribāṭs*, and *Zāwiyas* under the Mamlūks," in *Islamic Studies Presented to Charles J. Adams*, ed. Wael B. Hallaq and Donald P. Little, 91-105.
8. Ernst, *Eternal Garden*, 200-26, demonstrates how the Khuldābād Chishtī shrines in the Deccan came to be associated with various political regimes from the mid-eighth/fourteenth century onward. The same process is documented for the Qādirīs as well as the Chishtīs in Bijapur during the late eleventh/seventeenth century in Richard M. Eaton, *Sufis of Bijapur 1300-1700: Social Roles of Sufis in Medieval India*, 203-42.
9. Gölpınarlı, 153-54; Hans Joachim Kissling, "Einiges über den Zejnije-Orden im Osmanischen Reich," *Der Islam* 39 (1964): 143-79; idem, "Aus der Geschichte des Chalvetijje-Ordens," *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft* 103 (1953): 233-89.
10. Hodgson, 2:220.
11. Cf. Eaton's study of the relationship between "landed" Sufis and *majdhūb* dervishes in Bijapur of the late eleventh/seventeenth century: *Sufis of Bijapur*, 203-81.
12. While the conclusion that conversion to dervish piety occurred primarily among male youth of the cultural elite is certainly justified, it must be admitted that the historical record on this issue is scanty. The sources naturally reported mostly on dervishes of socially prominent backgrounds. It is, however, highly unlikely that any hard evidence on the social composition of the deviant dervish groups will be forthcoming in the future. Under the circumstances, it remains to be observed here that comparative sociological observation supports the validity of the view adopted here. The Franciscan movement in Europe, for instance, provides us with a close parallel: "although they [the Franciscans] recruited members from all social groups, their chief attraction was understandably to the more affluent middle class and to the clerical intelligentsia" (Clifford

H. Lawrence, *Medieval Monasticism: Forms of Religious Life in Western Europe in the Middle Ages*, 200). On a somewhat different note, compare the following works on the counterculture movement of the 1960s in the United States: Timothy Miller, *The Hippies and American Values*; Edward P. Morgan, *The Sixties Experience: Hard Lessons About Modern America*; and Peter Clecak, *America's Quest for the Ideal Self: Dissent and Fulfillment in the 60s and 70s*.

13. Abū 'Abd Allāh Musharrif al-Dīn ibn Muṣliḥ, known as Sa'dī, *Būstān*, ed. Muḥammad 'Alī Furūghī, 196. The English translation is reproduced from *Morals Pointed and Tales Adorned: The Būstān of Sa'dī*, trans. G. M. Wickens, 195 (chapter 7, tale 129).

8. CONCLUSION

1. On Ibn Taymīyah, see Henri Laoust, "Ibn Taymiyya," in *EI*, 3:951-55; on Birgivi, see Kasım Kufrevi, "Birgivi," in *EI*, 1:1235.

2. Compare Richard F. Gombrich, *Theravāda Buddhism: A Social History from Ancient Benares to Modern Colombo*, 49-59; and Patrick Olivelle, *Samnyāsa Upaniṣads: Hindi Scriptures on Asceticism and Renunciation*, 29-33.

3. Lester K. Little, *Religious Poverty and the Profit Economy in Medieval Europe*.

4. See Janet L. Abu-Lugod, *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250-1350*.

Bibliography

PRIMARY SOURCES

- ‘Abd Allāh Ansārī Haravī. *Risālah-i Qalandar’namah*. In *Rasā’il-i jāmi’-i ‘arīf-i qarn-i chahārum-i hijrī Khvājah ‘Abd Allāh Ansārī*, edited by Vahīd Dastgirdī, 92–99. Tehran: Majallah-i Armaghān, 1347sh/1968.
- ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Nu‘aymī. *Al-dāris fi ta’rīkh al-madāris*. Edited by Ja‘far al-Hasanī. 2 vols. Damascus: Maktabat al-Thaqāfat al-Dīniyah, 1988.
- ‘Abd al-Rahmān al-Dimashqī al-Jawbarī. *Kitāb al-mukhtār fi kashf al-asrār wa-hatf al-astār*. Ms. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), Karaçelebizade 253, dated 717/1317–18. French translation: *Le voile arraché: L’autre visage de l’Islam*. Translated by René R. Khawam. Paris: Phébus, 1979.
- ‘Abd al-Rashīd al-Tattavī. *Farhang-i Rashīdī*. Edited by Zūlfiqār ‘Alī and ‘Azīz al-Rahmān. 2 vols. Calcutta: Asiatic Society of Bengal, 1875.
- Abū Sa‘īd-i Abū al-Khayr. *Sukhanān-i manzūm-i Abū Sa‘īd-i Abū al-Khayr*. Edited by Sa‘īd Nafīsī. Tehran: Kitābkhānah-i Shams, 1334sh/1955.
- al-Aflākī, Shams al-Dīn Ahmad al-‘Arifī. *Manāqib al-‘arīfīn*. Edited by Tahsin Yazıcı. 2 vols. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1956–61.
- ‘Ahdī Ahmed Çelebi. *Gülşen-i şu‘arā*. Ms. British Library (London), Add. 7876, undated.
- Ahmad Amīn Rāzī. *Haft iqlīm*. Edited by Javād Fāzīl. 3 vols. Tehran: Kitābfurūshī-i ‘Alī Akbar ‘Ilmī, 1340sh/1961.
- Ahmad-i Jām, Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Naṣr Ahmad ibn Abī al-Ḥasan al-Nāmaqī al-Jāmī, known as Zhandah’Pīl. *Miftāḥ al-najāt*. Edited by ‘Alī Fāzīl. No. 40. Tehran: Bunyād-i Farhang-i Irān, 1347sh/1968.
- . *Rawzat al-muznibīn va jannat al-mushitāqīn*. Edited by ‘Alī Fāzīl. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Bunyād-i Farhang-i Irān, 1355sh/1976.
- Ahmed Refīk. *Onuncu ‘aṣr-i hicrīde İstānbül hayātı (961–1000)*. Tārīḥ-i ‘Osmānī Encümeni Külliyyātu. Istanbul: Matba‘a-i Orhānīye, 1333/1914–15.
- ‘Alī Şīr Nevā‘ī. *Nesāyīmü’l-mahabbe min şemāyimi’l-fittūvve*. Edited by Kemal Eraslan. No. 2654. Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1979.
- Amīr Hasan Sijzī. *Favā’id al-fu‘ād*. Delhi: Matba‘ah-i Hindu Press, 1282/1865. English translation: *Nizam ad-Dīn Awliya: Morals for the Heart*. Translated by Bruce B. Lawrence. Classics of Western Spirituality. New York: Paulist Press, 1992.
- ‘Āşīk Çelebi. *Meşār’ir üş-şu‘arā or Tezkere of ‘Āşīk Çelebi*. Edited by G. H. Meredith-Owens. E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, new series, vol. 24. London: Luzac and Co., 1971.
- ‘Āşīkpaşazāde, Dervīş Ahmed. *Die Altosmanische Chronik der ‘Āşīkpaşazāde*. Edited by Friedrich Giese. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz, 1929.

- ‘Attār, Farīd al-Dīn Muḥammad Nishābūrī. *Manṭiq al-ṭayr*. Edited by Sayyid Ṣādiq Gawḥarīn. Majmū‘ah-i Mutūn-i Fārsī, no. 15. Tehrān: Bungāh-i Tarjamah va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1342sh/1963.
- Bābā Ṭāhir ‘Uryān Hamadānī. *Divān-i Bābā Ṭāhir ‘Uryān Hamadānī*. Edited by Manūchīhr Adamīyat. Tehrān: Sāzmān-i Chāp va Intishārāt-i Iqbāl, 1361sh/1982.
- Baranī, Ziyā’ al-Dīn. *Tārīkh-i Firūz-Shāhī*. Edited by Saiyid Ahmad Khān. Calcutta: Bibliotheca Indica, 1862.
- Baudier de Languedoc, Michel. *Histoire générale de la religion des Turcs*. Rouen: Jean Berthelin (dans la Cour du Palais), 1641.
- Bent, J. Theodore, ed. *Early Voyages in the Levant: 1. The Diary of Master Thomas Dallam, 1599–1600; 2. Extracts from the Diaries of Dr. John Covel, 1670–1679*. Series 1, no. 87. London: Hakluyt Society, 1893.
- al-Bukhārī, Muḥammad. *Ṣaḥīḥ*. Arabic-English bilingual edition by Muḥammad Muḥsin Khān. 9 vols. Beirut: Dār al-‘Arabīyah, 1405/1985.
- Celālzāde Muṣṭafā, known as Koca Nişancı. *Geschichte Sultan Süleymān Kānūnīs von 1520 bis 1557 oder Tabākāt ül-memālīk ve derecāt ül-mesālīk von Celālzāde Muṣṭafā genannt Koca Nişancı*. Edited by Petra Kappert. Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplementband 21. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1981.
- Dabistān-i Mazāhib*. [By Kaykhusraw Isfandiyār?] Edited by Raḥīm Rizāzāda Malik. 2 vols. Tehrān: Kitābkhānah-i Ṭahūrī, 1362sh/1983.
- Dawlat-Shāh ibn ‘Alā’ al-Dawlah Bakhūtī-Shāh al-Ghāzī al-Samarqandī. *Tadhkirat al-shu‘arā’*. Edited by Edward G. Browne. Persian Historical Texts, vol. 1. London: Luzac and Co.; Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1901.
- al-Dhahabī, Shams al-Dīn Abū ‘Abd Allāh Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān al-Dī-mashqī. *al-‘Ibar fī khabar man ghabar*. Edited by Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Munajjid. 5 vols. al-Turāth al-‘Arabī, vols. 4, 5, 7, 10, and 15. Kuwait: Maṭba‘ah Hukūmat al-Kuwayt, 1960–66. Also vol. 3 of the edition by Abū Ḥājir Muḥammad al-Sa‘īd ibn Bisayūnī Zaghlūl. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-‘Ilmiyah, 1405/1985.
- . *Tārīkh al-Islām*, Part 63 (years 621–30). Edited by Bashshār ‘Awār Ma‘rūf, Shu‘ayb al-‘Arna‘ūt, and Ṣāliḥ Mahdī ‘Abbās. Beirut: Mu‘assasat al-Risālah, 1408/1988.
- d’Herbelot, Barthélemy. *Bibliothèque Orientale*. Paris: la Compagnie des Libraires, 1697.
- d’Ohsson, Mouradja. *Tableau général de l’Empire Othoman*. Vol. 4, pt. 1. Paris: l’Imprimerie de Monsieur, 1791.
- Du Mans, Raphaël. *Estat de la Perse en 1660*. Edited by Ch. Schefer. Publications de l’Ecole des Langues Orientales Vivantes, 2d series, vol. 20. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1890.
- Ebū’l-Ḥayr Rūmī. *Ṣaltuḡnāme*. Edited by Fahir İz. 7 vols. Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 4, Turkic Sources 4. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University, Office of the University Publisher, 1974–84.
- Edirneli Mecdī. *Ḥadā’ikū’-ṣ-ṣaḡā’ik*. Edited by Mehmed Recā’ī under the title *Terceme-i ṣaḡā’ik-i nu‘mānīye*. Istanbul: Dārū’t-Ṭibā‘ati’l-‘Āmire, 1269/1852–53.
- Evliyā Çelebi. *Evliyā Çelebi Seyāhatnāmesi*. Edited by Ahmed Cevdet and Necib ‘Aşım. 6 vols. Istanbul: İkdām Maṭba‘ası, 1314–18/1896–1901.
- Fakīrī. *Tārīfāt*. Ms. Istanbul Üniversitesi Kütüphanesi, TY 3051, undated.
- Faṣīḥ al-Dīn Ahmad ibn Muḥammad, known as Faṣīḥ al-Khvāfī. *Mujmal-i*

F
C

C

F

H

H

H

—

H

H

H

H

H

Ib

Ib

Ib

Ib

Ib

Ib

Ib

Ib

‘Ir

Isf

Isk

- Faṣīḥī*. Edited by Maḥmūd Farrukh. 3 vols. Mashhad: Kitābfurūshī-i Bāstān, 1341sh/1962.
- Fatīh Mehmed II Vākfiyeleri*. Ankara: Vakıflar Umum Müdürlüğü, 1938.
- Ghaznavī, Khvājah Sayyid al-Dīn Muḥammad. *Maqāmāt-i Zhandah'Pīl*. Edited by Hishmat Allah Mu'ayyad Sanandajī. Tehran: Bungāh-i Tarjamah va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1340sh/1961.
- Giyās al-Dīn ibn Humām al-Dīn Khvāndamīr. *Tārīkh-i ḥabīb al-siyar fī akhbār al-bashar*. Edited by Jalāl al-Dīn Humā'ī. 2d ed. Tehran: Khayyām, 1354sh/1975.
- Hāfiz Hüseyn ibn Ismā'īl Ayyvānsarāyī. *Ḥadīqatü'l-cevāmī'*. 2 vols. Istanbul: Maṭba'a-i 'Āmire, 1281/1864.
- Halvacıbaşızāde Maḥmūd Hulvī. *Leme'āt-i hulviye ez leme'āt-i 'ulviye*. Ms. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), Halet Efendi 281, undated.
- Ḥamd Allāh Mustawfī Qazvinī. *The Geographical Part of the Nuzhat-al-Qulūb Composed by Ḥamd-Allāh Mustawfī of Qazvin in 740 (1340)*. Edited by Guy Le Strange. E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, vol. 23. London: Luzac and Co., 1915.
- . *The Tārīkh-i Guzīdah*. Edited by Edward G. Browne. 2 vols. E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, vol. 14. London: Luzac and Co., 1910-13.
- Ḥamīd Qalandar. *Khayr al-majālis: Malfūzāt-i Ḥazrat-i Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn Maḥmūd, Chirāgh-i Dihlī*. Edited by Khaliq Ahmad Nizami. Aligarh: Muslim University, 1959.
- Ḥarīrīzāde Mehmed Kemāleddīn. *Tibyān wasā'il al-ḥaqā'iq fī bayān salās al-tarā'iq*. Ms. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), Ibrahim Efendi 430-32 (late 13th/19th century).
- Ḥayālī Beg. *Ḥayālī Bey Divānı*. Edited by Ali Nihat Tarlan. İstanbul Üniversitesi No. 3. Istanbul: Edebiyat Fakültesi Türk Dili ve Edebiyatı Yayınları, 1945.
- Ḥayrettī. *Divān: Tenkidli Basım*. Edited by Mehmed Çavuşoğlu and M. Ali Tanyeri. No. 2868. Istanbul: İstanbul Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Yayınları, 1981.
- Ibn Baṭṭūṭah. *Voyages d'Ibn Batoutah [Tuhfat al-nuẓẓār fī gharā'ib al-amṣār wa 'ajā'ib al-asfār]*. Edited by C. Defrémery and B. R. Sanguinetti. 4 vols. Paris: Société Asiatique, 1853-58.
- Ibn al-Imād, 'Abd al-Ḥayy ibn Ahmad. *Shadharāt al-dhahab fī akhbār man dhahab*. 8 vols. Cairo: Maktabat al-Qudsī, 1350-51/1931-32.
- Ibn al-Jawzī, 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Alī. *Talbīs Iblīs*. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah, 1368/1948-49.
- Ibn Karbalā'ī, Hāfiz Husayn Karbalā'ī Tabrizī. *Rawzat al-jinān va jannāt al-janān*. Edited by Ja'far Sulṭān al-Qurrā'ī. 2 vols. Majmū'ah-i Mutūn-i Fārsī, no. 20. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Bungāh-i Tarjamah va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1344-49sh/1965-70.
- Ibn al-Kathīr, 'Imād al-Dīn Ismā'īl ibn 'Umar. *al-Bidāyah wa-al-nihāyah*. 14 vols. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Sa'ādah, 1351-58/1932-39.
- Ibn Taymiyah, Taqī al-Dīn Ahmad. *Majmū'at al-rasā'il wa-al-masā'il*. 5 vols. in 2. Beirut: Dār al-Kutub al-Ilmiyah, 1403/1983.
- 'Irāqī, Fakhr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Hamadānī. *Kulliyāt-i divān-i Shaykh Fakhr al-Dīn Ibrāhīm Hamadānī mutakhallaṣ bi-'Irāqī*. Edited by M. Darvish. Tehran: Sāzmān-i Chāp va Intishārāt, n.d.
- Isfarāyīnī, Nūr al-Dīn 'Abd al-Rahmān. *Kāshif al-asār*. Edited by Hermann Landolt. Lagrasse: Editions Verdier, 1986.
- Iskandar Bag Munshī. *History of Shāh 'Abbās the Great*. Translated by Roger M.

- Savory. 2 vols. Persian Heritage Series, no. 28. Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1978.
- Jāmī, 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Aḥmad. *Nafahāt al-uns min ḥazarāt al-quḍs*. Edited by Mahdī Tawhīdī Pūr. Tehran: Kitābforūshī-i Sa'dī, 1337sh/1958.
- al-Jullābī, 'Alī ibn 'Uthmān al-Hujwīrī. *The Kashf al-Mahjūb: The Oldest Persian Treatise on Sufism by al-Hujwīrī*. Translated by Reynold A. Nicholson. London: Luzac and Co., 1911.
- Juvaynī, 'Alā' al-Dīn 'Atā Malik. *The History of the World-Conqueror [Tārīkh-i Jahān'gushā]*. Translated by John Andrew Boyle. 2 vols. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1958.
- Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl. *Ḳayḡusuz Abdāl'ın Mensur Eserleri*. Edited by Abdurrahman Güzel. 1000 Temel Eser Dizisi, no. 97. Ankara: Kültür ve Turizm Bakanlığı Yayınları (no. 545), 1983.
- Khaṭīb Fārisī. *Manāqib-i Jamāl al-Dīn Sāwī*. Edited by Tahsin Yazıcı. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1972. A later edition: *Qalandarnāmah-i Khaṭīb Fārisī yā Sīrat-i Jamāl al-Dīn Sāvajī*. Edited by Ḥamīd Zarrīnkūb. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Tūs, 1362sh/1983.
- Khayyām, 'Umar ibn Ibrāhīm Nishābūrī. *Tarānahā-yi Khayyām*. Edited by Şādiq Hidāyat. 5th ed. Tehran: Kitābhā-yi Parastū, 1352sh/1973.
- Ḳınalızāde Ḥasan Çelebi. *Tezkiretū's-ṣu'arā*. Edited by İbrahim Kutluk. 2 vols. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu Yayınları, 1978-81.
- Kitāb al-f laylah wa-laylah*. Edited by Muhsin Mahdī. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1984. English translation: *The Arabian Nights*. Translated by Husain Haddawy. New York: W. W. Norton and Co., 1990.
- Küçük, Abdāl. *Velāyetnāme-i Sulṭān Otman Baba*. (1) Ms. Adnan Ötügen İl Halk Kütüphanesi (Ankara), no. 643, dated 1173/1759. Copyist Eş-Şeyḥ 'Ömer ibn Dervīş Aḥmed. (2) Ms. Adnan Ötügen İl Halk Kütüphanesi (Ankara), nol 495, dated 1316/1899. Copyist Ḥasan Tebrīzī.
- al-Kutubī, Muḥammad ibn Shākir. *Fawāt al-wafāyāt*. Vol. 3. Edited by İhsān 'Abbās. Beirut: Dār Şādīr, 1974.
- Lāhūrī, Ghulām Sarvar. *Khazīnat al-asfiyā*. 2 vols. Lucknow, 1290/1873-74.
- Laṭīfī, 'Abdūllāṭif Çelebi. *Tezkire*. Istanbul: İḳdām Matba'ası, 1314/1896-97.
- al-Maqrīzī, Aḥmad ibn 'Alī. *al-Mawā'iz wa-al-i'tibār bi-dhikr al-khiṭaṭ wa-al-āthār*. 4 vols. Cairo: Matba'at al-Nīl, 1324-26/1906-8.
- Ma'sūm 'Alī Shāh ibn Raḥmat 'Alī Nī'mat Allāhī al-Shīrāzī. *Tarā'iq al-ḥaqā'iq*. Edited by Muḥammad Ja'far Mahjūb. 3 vols. Tehran: Kitābkhānah-i Bārānī, 1339-45sh/1960-66.
- Mehmed Şüreyyā. *Sicill-i 'Osmānī or Tezkire-i meşāhūr-i 'Osmāniye*. 4 vols. Istanbul: Matba'a-i 'Āmire, 1308-14/1890-97.
- Menavino, Giovan Antonio Genovese da Vultri. *Trattato de costumi et vita de Turchi*. Florence, 1548. German translation: *Türkische Historien: von der Türcken Ankunfft, Regierung, Königen und Kaisern, Kriegen, Schlachten, Victorien und Sigen, wider Christen und Heiden*. . . . Translated by Heinrich Müller. Frankfurt am Main, 1563.
- Mihailović, Konstantin. *Memoirs of a Janissary*. Translated by Benjamin Stolz. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1975.
- Muḥammad Ḥusayn ibn Khalaf al-Tabrīzī. *Burhān-i qāṭi'*. Edited by Muḥammad Mu'īn. 5 vols. Tehran: Ibn Sīnā, 1342sh/1963.
- Muḥammad ibn Bahādūr al-Zarkashī. *Zahr al-'arīsh fī ahkām (or taḥrīm) al-hashīsh*. In Franz Rosenthal, *The Herb: Hashish versus Medieval Muslim Society*, 176-97. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1971.

- Muḥammad ibn Mansūr Mubārak'Shāh, known as Fakhr-i Mudabbir. *Ādāb al-harb wa al-shajā'ah*. Edited by Aḥmad Suhaylī Khvānsārī. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Iqbāl, 1346sh/1967.
- Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Khaṭīb. *Fuṣṭāṭ al-'adālah fi qavā'id al-salṭanah*. Edited by Osman Turan, "Selçuk Türkiyesi din tarihine dair bir kaynak: Fuṣṭāṭ ul-'adāle fi qavā'id is-salṭana," 553-64 (Persian text). In 60. *Doğum Yılı Münasebetiyle Fuad Köprülü Armağanı*, 531-64. Istanbul: Ankara Üniversitesi Dil ve Tarih-Coğrafya Fakültesi, 1953.
- Muḥammad Qāsim Hindū'Shāh Astarābādī, known as Firishtah. *Gulshan-i Ibrāhīmī*, usually called *Tārīkh-i Firishtah*. Lucknow: Nawal Kishore, 1281/1864-65.
- Muḥ'in al-Dīn Muḥammad Zamajī Isfizarī. *Rawzāt al-jannāt fi awṣāf madīnah Harāt*. Edited by S. M. Kāzīm Imām. No. 535. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Dānishgāh-i Tih-rān, 1338sh/1959.
- Mujir al-Dīn al-'Ulaymī al-Hanbalī. *al-Uns al-jalīl bi-tārīkh al-quds wa-al-khalīl*. 2 vols. Cairo: Maṭba'at al-Wahbīyah, 1283/1866-67.
- Muṣṭafā 'Alī. *Ḥulāṣatū'l-ahwāl*. Edited by Andreas Tietze in "The Poet as Critique of Society: A 16th-Century Ottoman Poem." *Turcica* 9 (1977): 120-60.
- . *Kūnhū'l-ahbār*. Ms. British Library (London), Or. 32, undated.
- Muṣṭafā ibn 'Abdullāh, known as Kātib Çelebi. *Kashf al-zunūn*. Edited by Şerefettin Yaltkaya and Kilisli Rifat Bilge. 2 vols. Istanbul: Maarif Matbaası, 1941-43.
- Najm al-Dīn 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad Rāzī "Dāyah." *The Path of God's Bondsmen from Origin to Return*. Translated by Hamid Algar. Persian Heritage Series, no. 35. Delmar, N.Y.: Caravan Books, 1982.
- Naṣrābādī, Muḥammad Tāhir. *Tazkirah-i Naṣrābādī*. Edited by Vahīd Dastgirdī. Tehran: Chāpkhānah-i Armaghān, 1317sh/1938.
- Navā'ī, 'Abd al-Ḥusayn. *Asnād wa mukātabāt-i tārīkhī-i Īrān az Tīmūr tā Shāh Ismā'īl*. Majmū'ah-i Īrānshīnāsī, no. 22. Tehran: Intishārāt-i Bungāh-i Tarjamaḥ va Nashr-i Kitāb, 1341sh/1962.
- Nev'izāde, 'Aṭā'ullāh ibn Yahyā. *Hadā'ikū'l-ḥaqā'iq fi tekmlētī's-ṣakā'ik*. Edited by Mehmed Recā'ī. Istanbul: 1268/1851-52.
- Nicolas de Nicolay Daulphinoy, Seigneur d'Arfeuille. *Les navigations, pérégrinations et voyages, faicts en la Turquie, par Nicolas de Nicolay*. . . . Anvers: Guillaume Silvius, Imprimeur du Roy, 1576. English translation: *The Navigations, Peregrinations and Voyages, made into Turkie by Nicholas Nicholay Daulphinoy*. . . . Translated by T. Washington the Younger. London: Thomas Dawson, 1585. Facsimile edition, Amsterdam: De Capo Press and Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1968.
- Nūr Allāh ibn Sayyid Sharīf Ḥusaynī Mar'ashī Shushtarī. *Majālis al-mu'minīn*. Tehran: Sayyid Ḥusayn Tih-rānī, 1268/1852.
- Olearius, Adam. *Vermehrte Neue Beschreibung der Muscovitischen und Persischen Reyse*. Edited by Dieter Lohmeier. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1971.
- Oruç ibn 'Adil. *Tevārīḥ-i āl-i 'Osmān*. Edited by Franz Babinger. Hannover: Orient-Buchhandlung Heinz Lafaire, 1925. German translation: *Der Fromme Sultan Bayezid: Die Geschichte seiner Herrschaft (1481-1512) nach den altosmanischen Chroniken des Oruç und des Anonymus Hanivaldanus*. Translated by Richard F. Kreutel. Graz: Verlag Styria, 1978.
- Pūr-i Bahā, Tāj al-Dīn ibn Bahā al-Dīn Jāmī. *Kāmāma-yi awqāf*. In Birgitt Hoffman, "Von falschen Asketen und 'unfrommen' Stiftungen," 409-85 (text

- on 422-83). In *Proceedings of the First European Conference of Iranian Studies Held in Turin, September 7th-11th, 1987 by the Societas Iranologica Europaea*, part 2, *Middle and New Iranian Studies*. Edited by Gherardo Gnoli and Antonio Panaino. Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1990.
- al-Qazwīnī, Zakariyā' Muḥammad. *Āthār al-bilād wa-akhbār al-'ibād*. Beirut: Dār Ṣādir, 1380/1960.
- Ramāzānzāde Nišānci Mehmed, known as Küçük Nišānci. *Tārīḫ-i Nišānci Mehmed Paşa*. Istanbul: Tab'ḥāne-i 'Āmire, 1279/1862-63.
- Riyāzī Mehmed. *Riyāzū's-su'arā*. Ms. British Library (London), Or. 13501, dated 1337/1918-19. Copyist Aḥmed 'izzet.
- Rizā Qulī Khān Hidāyat. *Majma' al-fuṣṣahā*. 2 vols. Tehran: n.p., 1295/1878.
- Rūmī, Jalāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Balkhī, known as Mawlānā. *Masnavī-i ma'navī*. Edited by Reynold A. Nicholson. Vol. 1. E. J. W. Gibb Memorial Series, new series, no. 4. London: Luzac and Co., 1925.
- Ruy Gonzales de Clavijo. *Clavijo: Embassy to Tamerlane 1403-1406*. Translated by Guy Le Strange. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1928.
- Rycaut, Paul. *The History of the Present State of the Ottoman Empire*. 4th ed. London: John Starkey and Henry Brome, 1675.
- Sa'dī, Abū 'Abd Allāh Muḥarrif al-Dīn ibn Muṣliḥ. *Būstān*. Edited by Muḥammad 'Alī Furūghī. Tehran: Chāpkhānah va Kitābfurūshī-i Burūkhūm, 1316sh/1937. English translation: *Morals Pointed and Tales Adorned: The Būstān of Sa'dī*. Translated by G. M. Wickens. Persian Heritage Series no. 17. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974.
- al-Safādī, Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Khālīl ibn Aybak. *al-Wāfi bi-al-wafayāt*. Vol. 5. Edited by Sven Dederling. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1970.
- Schweigger, Salomon. *Ein neue Reyssbeschreibung auss Teutschland nach Constantinopel und Jerusalem*. Nuremberg: Johann Lantzberger, 1608. Reprint. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1964.
- Sehī Beg. *Hešt bihišt*. Edited by Günay Kut. Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 5, Turkic Sources 5. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Printing Office, 1978.
- Şemsī. *Deh murğ*. (1) Ms. British Library (London), Or. 7113, fols. 130b-150b, dated 998/1589-90. Copyist 'Abdülkerīm ibn Bākīr ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Iskender ibn 'Abdullāh. (2) Ms. British Library (London), Or. 7203, undated.
- Shīrvānī, Zayn al-'Ābidīn. *Būstān al-siyāḥah*. Edited by Sayyid 'Abd Allāh Mustawfī. Tehran: n.p., 1315/1897-98.
- Sieur du Loir. *Les voyage du Sieur du Loir*. Paris: François Clouzier, 1654.
- Spandugino, Theodoro. *I commentari di Theodoro Spandugino Cantacuscino Gentiluomo Costantinopolitano, dell'origine de' principi turchi, & de' costumi di quella natione*. Florence: Lorenzo, 1551. French translation: *Petit traité de l'origine des Turcs par Théodore Spandouyn Cantacasin*. Translated by Balarin de Raconis. Edited by Charles Schefer. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1896.
- al-Suhrawardī, Shihāb al-Dīn Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar. *'Awārif al-ma'ārif*. Cairo: Maktabat al-Qāhirah, 1973. German translation: *Die Gaben der Entkenntnisse des 'Umar as-Suhrawardī ('Awārif al-ma'ārif)*. Translated by Richard Gramlich. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1978.
- Tāciẓāde Sa'dī Çelebi. *Münşe'āi*. Edited by Necati Lugal and Adnan Erzi. Istanbul: İstanbul Fetih Derneği, İstanbul Enstitüsü Yayınları, 1956.
- Tarāshnāmah*. (1) Ms. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), Hacı Mahmud 3843/3, fols. 7a-9b. (2) Ms. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), İzmir 793/5, fols.

90a
folk
'Ubay
Vahidi
Vāh
88-
15.
tio:
Vā'iz
Ed
Nū
Vilāye
bu
al-Wā:
ma
Yemir
Cī
Yūsuf
i j

Abu-
13:
Adar
Ira
Ahm:
Ec
Ahm:
(1:
Algar
Algar
Er
Allo:
fli
Andr
by
Ansa
ed
ed
Arbe
A
Arjo:
O
U
'Ash:
C

- 90a-92a. (3) Ms. Süleymaniye Kütüphanesi (Istanbul), Pertev Paşa 635/3, fols. 22a-24b.
- ‘Ubayd-i Zākānī. *Hajvīyāt va hazlīyāt*. Tabriz: Intishārāt-i Ibn Sīnā, 1347sh/1968.
- Vāhidi. *Menākīb-i Hvoca-i Cihān ve Netīce-i Cān*. In Ahmet T. Karamustafa, *Vāhidi's Menākīb-i Hvoca-i Cihān ve Netīce-i Cān: Critical Edition and Analysis*, 88-293. Sources of Oriental Languages and Literatures 17, Turkish Sources 15. Cambridge, Mass.: Department of Near Eastern Languages and Civilizations, Harvard University, 1993.
- Vā‘iz Kāshifī, Fakhr al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Husayn. *Rashahāt ‘ayn al-hayāt*. 2 vols. Edited by ‘Alī Aṣghar Muṣṭafīyān. Silsilah-i Intishārāt-i Bunyād-i Nikūkārī-yi Nūriyānī, no. 15. Tehran: Bunyād-i Nikūkārī-yi Nūriyānī, 1977.
- Vilāyetnāme: Manākīb-i Hacı Bektāṣ-i Velī*. Edited by Abdülbaḳı Gölpinarlı. Istanbul: İnkilap Kitapevi, 1958.
- al-Wāsiṭī, Taqī al-Dīn ‘Abd al-Rahmān. *Tiryāq al-muḥibbīn fī ṭabaqāt khirqat al-mashāyikh al-‘arīfīn*. Cairo: Maṭba‘at Muḥammad Muṣṭafā, 1305/1888.
- Yemīnī. *Faḫr al-nāme-i emīrū’l-mu‘minīn ‘Alī*. Edited by Aḥmed Hızır. Istanbul: Cihān Maṭba‘ası, 1327/1909.
- Yūsuf ibn Ya‘qūb. *Menākīb-i ṣarīf ve tarīkatnāme-i pīrān ve meṣāyih-i tarīkat-i ‘ālīye-i ḫalvetīye*. Istanbul: n.p., 1290/1873-74.

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Abu-Lugod, Janet L. *Before European Hegemony: The World System A.D. 1250-1350*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Adamec, Ludwig, ed. *Historical Gazetteer of Iran*. Vol 2, Meshed and Northeastern Iran. Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1981.
- Ahmad, Aziz. *An Intellectual History of Islam in India*. Edinburgh: University of Edinburgh Press, 1969.
- Ahmad, Muhammad Tagi. "Who Is a Qalandar?" *Journal of Indian History* 33 (1955): 155-70.
- Algar, Hamid. "Barāq Bābā." In *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, 3:754-55.
- Algar, Hamid, Frederick de Jong, and Colin Imber. "Malāmātiyya." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, 6:223-28.
- Allouche, Adel. "The Origins and Development of the Ottoman-Safavid Conflict (906-962/1500-1555)." Ph.D. diss., University of Utah, 1980.
- Andrae, Tor. *In the Garden of Myrtles: Studies in Early Islamic Mysticism*. Translated by Birgitta Sharpe. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1987.
- Ansari, A. S. Bazmee. "Badī‘ al-Dīn." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, 1:858-859.
- . "Djalāl al-Dīn Ḥusayn al-Bukhārī." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, 2:392.
- . "Al-Djazārī." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, 2:522-23.
- Arberry, Arthur John. *Sufism: An Account of the Mystics of Islam*. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1950.
- Arjomand, Said Amir. *The Shadow of God and the Hidden Imam: Religion, Political Order, and Societal Change in Shi‘ite Iran from the Beginning to 1890*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.
- ‘Āshūr, Sa‘īd ‘Abd al-Fattāḥ. *Al-Sayyid Ahmad al-Badawī: Shaykh wa tariqatuh*. Cairo: al-Dār al-Miṣrīyah li’l-Ta’līf wa-al-Tarjamah, 1966.

- Aubin, Jean. "Un santón qūhistānī de l'époque timouride." *Revue des Etudes Islamiques* 35 (1967): 185-216.
- . "Shaykh Ibrāhīm Zāhid Gīlānī (1218?-1301)." *Turcica* 21-23 (1991): 39-53.
- Aydın, Filiz. "Seyitgazi Aslanbey köyünde 'Şeyh Şücaeddin' külliyesi." *Vakıflar Dergisi* 9 (1971): 201-25.
- Ayverdi, Ekrem Hakkı. *Osmanlı Mimârisinin İlk Devri*. 4 vols. Istanbul: İstanbul Fetih Cemiyeti, 1966-74.
- Babinger, Franz. "Koyun Baba." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, 5:283.
- Baldick, Julian. *Mystical Islam: An Introduction to Sufism*. New York: New York University Press, 1989.
- Barkan, Ömer Lütfi. "Osmanlı İmparatorluğunda bir iskân ve kolonizasyon metodu olarak vakıflar ve temlikler: I, İstila devirlerinin kolonizatör Türk dervişleri ve zâviyeler." *Vakıflar Dergisi* 2 (1942): 279-386.
- Bausani, Alessandro. "Hurûfiyya." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, 3:600-601.
- Bayramoğlu, Fuat. *Hacı Bayram-i Veli: Yaşamı, Soyu, Vakfı*. 2 vols. Ankara: Türk Tarih Kurumu, 1983.
- Bell, Catherine. "Religion and Chinese Culture: Toward an Assessment of 'Popular Religion.'" *History of Religions* 29 (1989): 35-57.
- Bernand, M. "Idjmā'." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, 3:1023-26.
- Birge, John Kingsley. *The Bektashi Order of Dervishes*. Hartford, Conn.: Hartford Seminary Press, 1937.
- Boratav, Pertev Naili. "Battal." In *İslam Ansiklopedisi*, 1:344-51.
- Bosworth, Clifford Edmund. "Karrāmiyya." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, 4:667-69.
- . *The Mediaeval Islamic Underworld: The Banū Sāsān in Arabic Society and Literature*. 2 vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1976.
- Böwering, Gerhard. "Baqā' and Fanā'." In *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, 3:722-24.
- . "Bestāmī, Bāyazīd." In *Encyclopaedia Iranica*, 4:183-86.
- . *The Mystical Vision of Existence in Classical Islam: The Qur'ānic Hermeneutics of the Šūfī Sahl At-Tustarī (d. 283/896)*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1980.
- Brockelmann, Carl. *Geschichte der Arabischen Litteratur*. 2 vols. (2d ed.) and 3 suppl. vols. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1937-49.
- Brown, John. *The Darvishes or Oriental Spiritualism*. Edited by H. A. Rose. London: Oxford University Press, 1927. Reprint, London: Frank Cass, 1968.
- Brown, Peter. *The Body and Society: Men, Women, and Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1988.
- . *The Cult of the Saints: Its Rise and Function in Latin Christianity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1981.
- Browne, Edward Granville. *A Literary History of Persia*. 4 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1928.
- Bulliet, Richard W. *The Patricians of Nishapur: A Study in Medieval Islamic Social History*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1972.
- Bürgel, Johann Christoph. "The Pious Rogue: A Study in the Meaning of Qalandar and Rend in the Poetry of Muhammad Iqbal." *Edebiyat* 4 (1979): 43-64.
- Burrill, Katheen R. F. *The Quatrains of Nesimī: Fourteenth Century Turcic Hurufi*. The Hague: Mouton, 1972.

Etudes

(1991):

akıflar

tanbul

dition,

York

zasyon

r Türk

dition,

r: Türk

ent of

-26.

artford

n, new

ety and

meneu-
80.

and 3

Rose.

, 1968.
n Early

hicago:

bridge:

c Social

ing of
(1979):

Hurufi.

Canard, M., and Mélikoff, I. "Baṭṭāl." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, 1:1102-4.

Chabbi, Jacqueline. "Khānqāh." In *The Encyclopaedia of Islam*, new edition, 4:1025-26.

———. "Réflexions sur le soufisme iranien primitif." *Journal Asiatique* 266 (1978): 37-55.

———. "Remarques sur le développement historique des mouvements ascétiques et mystiques au Khurasan." *Studia Islamica* 46 (1977): 5-72.

Chodkiewicz, Michel. *Le sceau des saints: Prophétie et sainteté dans la doctrine d'Ibn Arabi*. Paris: Editions Gallimard, 1986.

Clauson, Gerard. *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1972.

Clecak, Peter. *America's Quest for the Ideal Self: Dissent and Fulfillment in the 60s and 70s*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1983.

Cohen, Hayyim J. "The Economic Background and the Secular Occupations of Muslim Jurisprudents and Traditionists in the Classical Period of Islam (until the Middle of the Eleventh Century)." *Journal of the Economic and Social History of the Orient* 13 (1970): 16-61.

Constable, Giles. *Attitudes toward Self-Inflicted Suffering in the Middle Ages*. Brookline, Mass.: Hellenic College Press, 1982.

Cook, Michael. *Early Muslim Dogma: A Source-Critical Study*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1981.

Cornell, Vincent. "Mirrors of Prophethood: The Evolving Image of the Spiritual Master in the Western Maghrib from the Origins of Sufism to the End of the 16th Century." Ph.D. dissertation, UCLA, 1990.

Dabashi, Hamid. *Authority in Islam: From the Rise of Muhammad to the Establishment of the Umayyads*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers, 1989.

Dankoff, Robert. "Baraq and Burāq." *Central Asiatic Journal* 15 (1971): 102-17.

De Bruijn, J. T. P. "The Qalandariyyāt in Persian Mystical Poetry, from Sanaʿī Onwards." In *The Legacy of Mediaeval Persian Sufism*, edited by Leonard Lewisohn, 75-86. London: Khaniqahi Nimatullahi Publications, 1992.

Digby, Simon. "Qalandars and Related Groups: Elements of Social Deviance in the Religious Life of the Dehli Sultanate of the 13th and 14th Centuries." In *Islam in South Asia*, vol. 1, *South Asia*, edited by Yohanan Friedmann, 60-108. Jerusalem: Magnes Press/Hebrew University, 1984.

Dihkhudā, 'Alī Akbar. *Kitāb-i amṣāl va ḥikam*. 4 vols. Tehran: Maṭba'at-i Majlis, 1310sh/1931.

———. *Lughāt-nāmah*. Tehran: Dānishgāh-i Tih-rān, Dānishkadāh-i Adabīyāt, Sāzmān-i Lughāt-nāmah, 1327-60sh/1948-81.

Dols, Michael W. Majnūn: *The Madman in Medieval Islamic Society*. Edited by Diana E. Immisch. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

During, Jean. *Musique et extase: L'Audition mystique dans la tradition soufie*. Paris: Albin Michel, 1988.

Eaton, Richard M. *Sufis of Bijapur 1300-1700: Social Roles of Sufis in Medieval India*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978.

Ergun, Sadeddin Nüzhet. *Bektaşî Edebiyatı Antolojisi: Bektaşî Şairleri ve Nefesleri*. 2d ed. 3 vols. in 2. Istanbul: Maarif Kitaphanesi, 1955-56.

———. *Türk Şairleri*. 3 vols. Istanbul: Bozkurt (and others), 1936-45.

Ernst, Carl W. *Eternal Garden: Mysticism, History, and Politics at a South Asian Sufi Center*. Albany: State University of New York Press, 1992.